

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 06825716 5

ZHEF
BRONSON

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM:

AN

EXAMINATION

OF THE

REV. MR. FOWLER'S LECTURES

ON THE

"MODE AND SUBJECTS OF BAPTISM."

By ^{Sc}A. BRONSON,

Pastor of the First Baptist Church in Fall River, Mass.

"Buy the truth and sell it not."

"Truth needs no apology, and error deserves none."

PROVIDENCE:

R. H. BROWN ...25 MARKET SQUARE.

1835.

P

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

904006A

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

M

1937

L

Entered according to an Act of Congress, in the year 1835, by
Rev. A. Bronson, in the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Rhode
Island.

The following notices have been received by the Printer and myself while the work was in progress. I have been obliged to abridge them, for want of room.

“TO THE REV. ASA BRONSON.

My Dear Brother :—I am glad to learn that you intend to reply to Mr. Fowler's publication on Baptism. I trust you may be enabled to exhibit patience in wading through such a mass of fallacious argumentation. I am surprised that so many respectable men have lent their names in the recommendation of such harsh and uncharitable statements. Can they have read the book, and not perceived that it is, in a large degree, made up of

‘Perverted texts and strained allusions,
False premises and wrong conclusions’?

I am not fond of controversy, and would advise others to abstain from it, but I confess that you seem to be called upon to defend ‘the faith’, by the systematic and repeated attacks which have been made upon you.

Wishing you success in your attempts to advance the *cause of truth*, and expose this remnant of Popery, which has so unhappily been appended to it, I am yours with affectionate respect,

JOHN O. CHOULES,
Pastor of First Baptist Ch. New-Bedford, Mass.”

“MY DEAR BROTHER:—

That God's dear people should differ on the plain and holy ordinance of Baptism, is cause of sincere and deep regret. I have examined a few pages of your book on that subject, and believe you have taken the side of Bible truth. I hope it will be read with candid and prayerful attention. Bible truth and holy love are greatly needed to unite the disciples of Christ; and so far as your book tends to promote these, it has the full approbation of your friend and brother,

JOHN BLAIN,
Pastor of the Pine-street Baptist Church, Providence, R. I.”

“I have examined with some attention the proof-sheets of Rev. Asa Bronson's forth-coming work on Baptism, in reply to Rev. Orin Fowler.

The respected author has exhibited great industry and research in collecting passages from Greek Classical writers, to prove that the original word *baptizo* is a *specific* and not a *generic* term, and that its appropriate signification is to *immerse*. He has availed himself, as he of course, had a right to do, of the learned labors of Ryland, Carson, Ripley and others. He has culled from the pages of that *unanswered* and *unanswerable* work of Carson, on the philological part of the controversy, the most interesting and conclusive classical quotations.

I would particularly call the attention of any who doubt whether classic usage ought not to constitute the final appeal, and at once settle the controversy, to the plain, common sense remarks in the first four pages of the second chapter. That classic usage fixes the mean-

WOR 20 JUN '34

ing of the word—as signifying to immerse—is triumphantly proved in the sequel of the chapter, from the writings of ancient Greeks and from the practice of the modern Greeks—from the testimony of those who sprinkle infants, as well as those who baptize adults.

I was particularly pleased with the manner in which the *onus probandi* is thrown, where it ought to be, on the shoulders of Pædobaptists, in the remarks on the Greek word *Thapto*, to bury, page 140–144. The argument is ingenious, and the deductions are fair.

Upon the whole, I have great pleasure in recommending the work not only to those who, residing in the neighborhood, have watched the progress of this controversy from its commencement, but to all who wish to satisfy themselves upon the question, what is scripture baptism?—as a faithful defence of the practice of Christ and his Apostles, embracing the cream of the best works which have been written upon the subject.

JOHN DOWLING,

Pastor of North Bap. Ch. Newport, R. I."

"NEWPORT, JULY 26, 1835

REV. AND DEAR SIR,

Having recently perused the Lectures of the Rev. Mr. Fowler, on the mode and subjects of baptism, from the manner in which he has treated those subjects, and his frequent allusion to the Baptists, I was induced to expect a reply. Not, that I think them entitled, in any respect, to a very high reputation, and should consider them entirely harmless, but for the very respectable names by which their reputation is sustained. These give them sufficient importance not only to warrant but to demand a reply. And it is confidently believed that every mind that is disembarassed and free from sectarian prejudice, will readily perceive, by examining your reply, that the 'blaze of evidence', in the light of which those Lectures were doubtless written, vanishes in smoke; and that infant sprinkling and adult affusion are unauthorized by the commission of our Lord, and without support from the word of God.

Accept, Sir, my acknowledgments for the perusal of the manuscript of your reply, and believe me yours in the faith of the gospel,

ARTHUR A. ROSS,

Pastor of the 1st Bap. Ch. Newport.

REV. A. BRONSON."

"REV. A. BRONSON,

Dear Sir—I have not been able to read but about 100 pages of your book. Absence from home and a multiplicity of other cares have deprived me of the privilege of reading the whole; but so far as I have examined it, I can honestly say, that I have never read a work on the same subject, which, in my opinion, has more effectually accomplished its design. With your own pertinent remarks, you have appropriately mingled ideas in extracts drawn from very many of the best of writers, which makes your work doubly valuable. I think you have done the cause of truth a good service. Being not a member of your particular denomination, and differing from you on the subject of the communion, I hope I may have some reasonable claim to disinterestedness in wishing your book an extensive circulation and a candid perusal.

Yours truly,

Pawtucket, July 30, 1835.

RAY POTTER,

Minister of the Gospel.

CONTENTS.

Introduction, - - - - -	Page 7
CHAPTER I.	
Examination—Preliminary Remarks, - - - - -	13
CHAPTER II.	
Classic usage, - - - - -	21
CHAPTER III.	
Testimony of Lexicographers, - - - - -	53
CHAPTER IV.	
Testimony of Critics, - - - - -	60
CHAPTER V.	
Historic Evidence, - - - - -	68
CHAPTER VI.	
Testimony of Historians respecting the Baptism of Infants, - - - - -	88
CHAPTER VII.	
Scriptural View of Baptism, - - - - -	107
CHAPTER VIII.	
The Baptism of John, - - - - -	126
CHAPTER IX.	
The Baptism of Christ, - - - - -	131
CHAPTER X.	
Greek Prepositions, - - - - -	136
CHAPTER XI.	
Attending Circumstances of Baptism, - - - - -	140
CHAPTER XII.	
Passages from the Old Testament, which are quoted to prove that Affusion is Baptism, - - - - -	151
CHAPTER XIII.	
Meaning of Baptizo in the New Testament—Identity of the Jewish and the Gospel Churches—Abrahamic Covenant— Circumcision—Baptism substituted for Circumcision, &c. - - - - -	153

	CHAPTER XIV.	
Household Baptism, - - - - -		190
	CHAPTER XV.	
Utility of Infant Baptism, - - - - -		201
	CHAPTER XVI.	
Communion, - - - - -		209

INTRODUCTION.

What ! another book on Baptism ? Yes : recent events, and Mr. Fowler's Lectures show, that it is necessary to have line upon line, precept upon precept, here a little and there a little, on the subject of Gospel Baptism. " But I do not relish controversy on religious subjects. I do not like to see Christians contending with each other." Controversy, in itself, is unpleasant ; but it is often necessary in a world which abounds with error. I can assure the reader that I have to bear a ' cross,' while writing on this subject in opposition to a man whom I desire, as far as possible, to esteem and love. I have been prompted by a sense of duty, and a humble desire to promote, what I believe to be, the truth of God. Whether I have pursued the happiest course, and employed the best means to accomplish my object, is yet to be determined. But why should a sincere and manly defence of truth and a determined rejection of error be considered harsh severity, or an exemplification of unkind feeling ?

' Who was the first Christian controversialist ?' The *Prince of Peace*. Jesus, the friend of sinners, when he called his twelve disciples and sent them forth, commanding them to preach that the kingdom of heaven is at hand, proclaimed, " Think not that I am come to send peace on earth ; I am not come to send peace, but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law ; and a man's foes shall be they of his own household." Matt. x : 34, 36. Stephen, the protomartyr, was an evangelical polemic of almost unequalled energy ; and during his short conflict, his face shone as it had been the face of an angel, while the infidel scoffers were not ' able to resist the wisdom and spirit by which he spake.' The apostle Paul disputed daily in the school of Tyrannus, and for his extraordinary capacity and success as a reasoner, confounding them who ' pretended to be Jews, but who were of the synagogue of Satan,' he is immortalized as one of the chief of them who have turned the ' world upside down.' Peter, James, Jude and John, with their apostolic brethren and the primitive evangelists, are also renowned as Christian controversialists, who ' contended earnestly for the faith which was once delivered to the saints.'

It is common to hear persons, who ought to be better informed on these topics, reprobating the defence of truth, because it necessarily

involves opposition to error and implies contention. What is the preaching of the gospel but controversy? Is it not the very method appointed by God himself, to maintain 'the good fight of faith,' until the triumphs of the cross shall have encircled the whole human family? It seems now to be generally received as a principle which admits of no denial, that all defence of religious truth naturally includes a hatred of those who hold the opposite errors. This position is as contrary to the wisest and best examples, as it is to sound theory.—However marvellous the fact may appear to the inconsiderate, it is incontestably true that the most renowned philanthropists have ever been the chief masters in religious controversy.*

I call your attention to an examination of the Rev. Mr. Fowler's Lectures 'on the mode and subjects of baptism,' for the following reasons.

1. The subject is important. It involves the welfare of Zion and the honor of her King.

2. The public mind has become agitated on this subject, and I desire that truth may be elicited, and Christian baptism fairly and fully investigated.

3. Debate awakes attention and excites interest. I think the candid inquirer will be more likely to apprehend the truth, and judge of the merits of the impending question with greater accuracy, if I write in opposition to Mr. F. than he would, were I to write an essay on this subject, without regard to the arguments which he has urged in favor of his views.

4. Among the advocates of 'affusion', he is unquestionably one of the 'ablest champions'. He has been thoroughly trained to this kind of warfare; he has, by his own acknowledgment, bestowed much labor on his 'Lectures'; he has 'availed himself of all possible helps on both sides of the controversy'; he has consulted Professors and Doctors of Divinity from Andover to Philadelphia; his lectures are highly recommended by Rev. Messrs. Robins, Holmes, Waterman and Phinney. We may safely infer, therefore, that the lectures before us contain a defence of the author's views, as able as New England divines can produce. I think they are entitled to a candid, but *faithful* examination.

5. The author has evidently kept his eye upon a pamphlet recently published by me at the request of my brethren. In several instances he has quoted whole sentences from it, and then tells the public in his appendix that there 'is so much ridicule and vulgarity and personal abuse in that pamphlet, that he deemed it inexpedient to notice it.'

Now I shall cheerfully leave my intelligent and candid fellow citizens to judge between me and the author, with regard to these charges of abuse, vulgarity, &c. after they have read my 'Address' in reply to 'Concord', and my 'Response' to the First Congregational Church in Fall River; and especially when they shall have considered the course which Mr. F. and his people have taken with regard to this controversy. Still, as the author of these lectures aims his artillery at me, (though he has not used my name,) it seems to devolve on me to examine his lectures. And as I have from the first been willing that the light of day should shine on the whole of this controversy, I shall not now seek concealment, nor resort to artifice, but endeavor openly and fearlessly, and yet affectionately, to expose error and defend truth.

In prosecuting the work before me, I intend to treat Rev. Mr. Fowler and his people with entire respect; and I hope that I may yet live and have opportunity to give them and the world substantial proof that I do not indulge any unkind feeling toward them as Christians. It would afford me 'sacred joy' to do them good—to promote their immortal welfare—to reciprocate every expression of Christian love.' I do sincerely, before God and men, publicly invite an interchange of kind offices with the Rev. Mr. Fowler and the members of his church, and I do hope that no unpleasant feelings arising from this controversy will be allowed to obstruct a friendly intercourse with each other.

Still, in view of existing circumstances—as the author of these Lectures and the First Congregationalist Church in Fall River have *deliberately* and *unitedly* and *publicly* enlisted in this debate on baptism; as it has evidently been their object to lay a prohibition, a kind of Ecclesiastical *veto* on me—(See 'Statement of Facts'); as I believe they are in an error on this subject; as it is a subject of vast importance—involving the glory of God and the welfare of the church; as their publications are public property; as I stand pledged before this community to notice whatever they publish on this subject which appears to me to clash with the word of God—(See my Address, page 63, 64); I cannot consistently let these Lectures pass without examination. To remain silent would be to do injustice to my own feelings, and, what is more, silence would be construed as a virtual abandonment of my ground in the debate, and a tacit admission that Mr. Fowler's Lectures contain sound and unanswerable argument. This, in view of my responsibility to God, I cannot, *in conscience*, admit. I am constrained, therefore, to resume my pen, not from the love of controversy—not by hostility to my opponents—not by a desire to

plume my brow with the 'victor's wreath'—but, if I mistake not, by the love of truth, and a desire, in the fear of God, to perform what has now become a painful but imperious duty. While I intend to treat the author, on all occasions, with becoming respect—I shall examine his Lectures with the utmost freedom. I shall probably carry along with me my usual *ardency* of feeling and *plainness* of style; but I hope not to pen a sentence, which shall injure the cause of Christ, give needless pain to a member of his body, or be a source of sorrow to myself when reviewed on the pillow of death.

TO THE READER.

N. B. I have endeavored to write so as to be understood by *all* my readers. My object has been, not so much to instruct the *learned*, as to satisfy honest inquiries among the great mass of the community, who have but little time to spend in searching histories, and in reading more learned and elaborate treatises on this subject. And yet I believe that the numerous quotations from the best authors, Baptist and Pædobaptist, will not be useless or uninteresting to my learned brethren in the ministry. I have treated the subject in a way to render it useful to those who know nothing of the controversy in this place. The work is by no means made up of localities. It takes a general view of the best arguments which have been employed on both sides of the impending question. It is a discussion of that precious ordinance of Jesus, which was given as his own boundary line between his obedient disciples and the unbelieving world, an ordinance which is intimately and inseparably connected with the purity and prosperity of Zion. I have read at different times, several publications on baptism. I endeavor to retain, what seems to be worth remembering when I read. My views on this topic, as well as others, have been derived from various sources. They have become incorporated with my own system of Theology; and in many instances it would be impossible for me to tell from whom I first received them.—For *some* of the ideas contained in the following pages, I cheerfully acknowledge myself indebted to Carson, Chapin, and Lynd. Their style as well as their sentiments, are somewhat familiar to me, and I doubt not, I have in some cases, unconsciously employed a phrasology very similar to theirs. But when I have copied from them, I have used the marks of quotation, and generally named the author. In a few instances I know that I have used very nearly the same language of Mr. Carson, without the use of quotation marks, because I preferred the making of this general acknowledgment, to the searching of his book, and looking out the page and the passage and copying his language exactly. His divisions are not very fully and distinctly marked, and in many instances I could write out the substance of a sentence twice, while I could search out the sentence itself *once*. I have had no time to lose in this way, having been oblig-

ed to *throw* my book together between short intervals of pastoral labor. Hence without looking into his book at the time, I have used perhaps very nearly his language in a few instances, and yet I have not ventured to insert it as a quotation, lest I should do him injustice by a *misquotation*. Five or six of the last examples of the classic use of *baptizo* were selected from Dr. Ryland's 'Candid Statement.' I am, as the reader will perceive by the numerous citations, peculiarly indebted to Prof. Stuart. *Truth* is a jewel of inestimable value, it matters not from whose hand we receive it.

To defend truth, expose sophistry, and refute error, not to immortalize my name as a writer, is the object of the following examination. If I have written any thing contrary to truth, may God forgive me and show me my error. So far as I have been enabled to write the truth, may Jehovah sanctify it to the good of souls, and the welfare of his church.

THE AUTHOR.

CHRISTIAN BAPTISM.

CHAPTER I.

EXAMINATION—PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

Mr. Fowler has chosen his text Matt. xxviii: 18, 19. The division of his subject is natural and easy:—1. The mode; 2. The subjects of baptism. The discussion, if I mistake not, evinces some ingenuity, much calculation, more sophistry, and the whole is copiously ‘affused’ with *assertions* strong as ‘solid rock.’ The author appears like a man of considerable reading, but of little original, independent thought. For *misrepresentation* and *strong unfounded assertions*, he will probably continue to bear the palm. Nor do I lament the want of talent and inclination to rob him of this glory.

The assertion, that ‘Christ in this commission instituted Christian baptism,’ will be considered in its proper place. In his preliminary remarks he says, ‘There is no injunction any where given in the Bible respecting the *mode* in which baptism must be performed. We are simply directed to be baptized.’ I reply, as the Bible says nothing about modes of baptizing any more than the modes of sprinkling or burying, we will leave *modes* and inquire what is baptism? I suppose, however, that when we find *baptism* we shall find *mode*. Or can the author amuse and instruct us by giving us a baptism without mode! Christ enjoined a baptism which has *no* mode, or a baptism which *is* mode and nothing *but* mode, or he enjoined a baptism which has *many* modes. If the first, then he enjoined a non-entity—for there is no *external* rite without a mode in existence—there can be none. If the second,

then it is important to understand what that mode is, for without that mode we have no baptism. If the third, if baptism has many modes, as washing, wetting, sprinkling, pouring, &c., then the author must immerse and wash and wet and pour and sprinkle his candidate, or he is not baptized—because pouring is only one mode among many, and if he only pours, he has but a small part of baptism. And unless he can prove that a part, and a small *part*, is equal to the whole, his *baptism* is very imperfect and defective.

I hope the candid reader will not suffer his mind to be entangled with the sophistry of *modes*, but go along with me and endeavor to ascertain the nature and design of gospel baptism. The remark, page 10th, that we are ‘not commanded to be immersed,’ is a mere sophism, a play upon words; like the Arminian notion that God is not a sovereign, because the word *sovereign* is not found in the Bible. If God be the independent Ruler of the universe, then he is a sovereign, although this word sovereign is not in the scriptures. And if the Greek word, used to express the act of baptizing, signifies immersion, then God has commanded us to be immersed, although the word immersion is not found in the English Bible. God hath required believers to be baptized; whether baptism be immersion or affusion, the reader will judge at the close of this examination.

On page 10th, Mr. F. calls the attention of his hearers to the **BASE CONDUCT** of the Baptists, or, as he denominates them, ‘the advocates of immersion.’ Well, what have they done? ‘Any thing worthy of death or of bonds?’ ‘Being unable to meet the arguments we bring from the Old Testament, in support of affusion, they assume the fearful responsibility of rejecting that part of the Bible as obsolete, so far as it touches upon this subject.’ This is a heavy charge. Suppose the Baptists were to reject that part of the Old Testament which treats of steam-boat navigation, the use of gun-powder, the baptism of *meeting house bells*, and *sponsors*, *exorcism*, *salt* and *spittle*, as well as *sprinkling in baptism*. Now what portion of the Old Testament do we reject? Is it

the 119th Psalm? *That* says as much in favor of affusion for baptism as any part of the ancient scriptures with which I am acquainted. Would Mr. F. consider us bad citizens if we should reject that part of the Constitution of the United States 'so far as it touches upon' the subject of infant 'affusion'? I am not aware that the Constitution of the United States touches 'upon this subject.' The Legislature of Massachusetts once took this business in hand, and enacted the following law: 'It is ordered and agreed, that if any person or persons within this jurisdiction, shall openly condemn or oppose the *baptizing of infants*, or go about secretly to seduce others from the approbation and use thereof, or shall purposely depart the congregation at the ministration of the ordinance, * * * and shall appear to the court wilfully and obstinately to continue therein, after due time and means of conviction, *every such person or persons shall be sentenced to banishment.*'* I rejoice that this law is now 'obsolete', but perhaps Mr. F. will mourn over the loss of one of the most *powerful* arguments which has ever been employed to support infant sprinkling! He must have known that the question between us is, not whether the Old Testament is to be received or rejected, but whether it regulates the administration of New Testament ordinances. He affirms. I deny. The passages he has quoted have no bearing on the subject. If I do not reject those precious texts until he brings *them* and the affusion of infants to 'touch' each other, they will never become obsolete while the 'sea rolls a wave,' or the world endures. As the author was well acquainted with our views in this matter, it was 'exceedingly reprehensible and disingenuous' to misrepresent them. Let it be known, that we do firmly believe with Paul that '*all* scripture is given by inspiration and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction and instruction in righteousness.' But we *do not* believe that any part of scripture, when carefully examined in its proper connexion and evident import, will be found profitable for Pædo affusion. 'We

* See Backus's History.

say frankly that we have no sympathy for a system the support of which requires' the manifest perversion of any part of the Bible.

2. 'They, (the advocates of immersion,) resort to the artifice of raising questions about infant baptism, while the *mode* is under discussion.' But as every case of baptism must include an administrator, a candidate, and a mode, I see no manifest impropriety in 'starting questions' which relate to the essentials of this sacred rite. I believe it safe and proper to ask concerning any scriptural account of baptism,—'Is it possible that there were infants included in this account?' This question, though pertinent, is, indeed, *vexatious* to Mr. F. After rearing up with much toil the fair temple of Pædobaptism,—a temple made up of materials drawn from '*Abrahamic covenant*,' 'holy children,' 'circumcision,' councils and the Pope,—to have the whole shaken by the *earthquake* of a simple appropriate question, this is too much for poor human nature to endure. If the system of our author is based on solid rock, as he supposes, he has nothing to fear. Baptist questions do not crumble the rocks. They may unmask error and expose sophistry.

3. 'They represent some one denomination of Pædobaptists as composing but a small part of the Christian world, and then infer that immersion is the only mode.' We have never claimed that a majority of the religious world were *practical* Baptists. We have sometimes alluded to the well known fact, that an overwhelming majority of learned Christians have from the beginning admitted, and do still admit, that the plain, primary meaning of baptizo is to dip, to immerse; and that immersion was the common practice of the church for thirteen hundred years. This fact will be considered and established and improved, under the head of historic evidence. Does the question arise, why do not those who make these concessions become Baptists, and practice immersion? Really, I cannot tell. Perhaps those, (and there are thousands of them in New England,) who are entirely dissatisfied with the sprinkling which they received in unconscious infancy, and yet continue in Pædobaptist

churches, can assign a reason why they do not obey God according to their own acknowledged convictions of duty, and 'arise and be baptized.'

Many, in the last half century, have left brethren who were dear to their hearts, and submitted to what seemed to them to be gospel baptism. Perhaps more will soon follow their example, and find by happy experience that in keeping the commands of Christ there is great reward. Others will probably be unwilling to break away from their Christian friends, to whom they are endeared by long acquaintance and a reciprocation of kind offices, and thus live on in their bondage, and wear the Abrahamic yoke, which was riveted on their necks before they could distinguish their right hand from their left. Others will be made to believe that baptism is one of the 'non-essentials,' and no matter how it is performed; although sprinklers are writing and lecturing and publishing and consulting and corresponding and ransacking 'histories' and the 'writings of the fathers;' and all for the purpose of propping up a 'non-essential' affusion! When, after all, according to Mr. F., baptizo may have 'fifty meanings, each of which is as good as the first'! How inconsistent men may be.

Others still may be led to believe with Mr. F. that baptizo means to sprinkle; that 'John' sprinkled his candidates, and that our Saviour was sprinkled. But this class of Pædobaptists is very small, and is yearly diminishing. The most learned and candid Pædobaptists, and those who are the most deeply read in this controversy, as I shall show hereafter, belong to another class.

4. P. 11th. 'They have for half a century past been calling over the list of all who have left the Pædobaptists and joined them, and drawn the inference that themselves only are right.' No; here is a small mistake. Knowing that we were right in the ordinance of baptism, we rejoiced to have others follow the direction of the word of God. We have never believed that the prevalence and popularity of a religious custom was certain proof that it was right; if so, the Pope and his legions are right, and Protestants are all wrong. We have drawn no such inference,

to prove what was well established by positive and substantial evidence before. I think the assertion that a list of *all* those who have joined the Baptists, has been called over, is too broad. No public list of the names of one in fifty has ever been called over. He then remarks that 'this method of defending their views would never be practised but for the paucity of sound arguments.' And what next? Why, he then gives us a list of those who have left the Baptists and joined the *affusionists*! Surely there must have been a 'paucity,' nay a *famine* of sound arguments with him, or he would not in *the same sentence* condemn this artifice, and then employ it himself! Strange that he should with his own pen write 'Tekel' on his own cause!

Was it the 'paucity of sound argument' that induced the Rev. Mr. Fowler, under the name of 'Concord,' (as is generally supposed) before I had written a sentence, or preached a sermon on baptism in this place, to say in the Fall River Recorder, "Is it because they are *chafed* to see the Congregationalists increase so rapidly? or is it because so many Baptists—ministers and private members, both male and female, are leaving the Baptists and joining the Congregationalists?" And why did the First Congregational church in Fall River call meeting after meeting, and 'prop and guard' their beloved 'Concord', by passing the deliberate and formal resolution that his articles, containing this language, were 'a sound and scriptural defence of their doctrines and forms of worship, and, as such, they approved of them most heartily and fully'? Why all this? Ah! the author has let us into the secret. Rev. Mr. Fowler and his people 'would never have practised this method of defending their views' but for the 'paucity of sound arguments.' The idea that 'so many were leaving the Baptists and joining the Congregationalists' has no foundation on truth. If any man doubts my assertion, let him examine the statistics of the Baptists and Congregationalists one hundred years ago, and then their present numbers—either in New England or in the United States—and he will be astonished at the *sectarian folly* which gave *publicity* to such a sentence, and which after-

wards prompted the resolution that 'this was a sound and scriptural way to defend the doctrines and forms of worship embraced by the First Congregational Church in Fall River.' Perhaps, however, it will 'serve a purpose' with the '*ignorant and uninformed*.'

The author, it seems, from page 12th, continues as usual to act on the defensive. But this community will recollect that he has lectured on this subject *repeatedly*: whereas I have never made baptism the exclusive theme of discourse but once in Fall River, although I have been preaching the gospel and baptizing believers for two years in this place. They will also remember that a certain 'Concord' entered the field of baptismal controversy before me, and mounted his battery and tried the strength of his calibre, by declaring in our village newspaper that 'the Baptists have never yet proved, and cannot prove for a certainty, that any one of those spoken of as baptized in the New Testament were immersed'; and that because 'baptism is spoken of in the New Testament as baptizing *with* water rather than *in* water, the conclusion is irresistible that the mode is by pouring and not by immersion.' And it will, I suppose, be allowed *now* on all sides that this 'Concord' was the Rev. Mr. Fowler. But he says in his lectures, 'we Pædobaptists act on the defensive.' Suppose Napoleon, while marching his army into Moscow, had said, 'My brave fellow soldiers, *we* Frenchmen act on the defensive!' Might not some honest Russian have enquired, 'what business have you, Sir, in Moscow, at the head of an invading army?

He brings several other allegations against the Baptists—but as they will all be noticed and answered in the course of examination on the several topics to which they allude, I will now pass to the main subject of these lectures. It is evident that in the estimation of our author the advocates 'of immersion' are a *degenerate race—an unlovely brood*. I hope they will improve in manners, morals and religion, and that his example and efforts will not be lost upon them, like water spilled upon the ground.

His first object is to prove that baptizo means affusion. He appeals to various sources for arguments to sustain his

position. My object is to examine and refute his arguments fairly, and appeal to the same sources for proof to sustain me in my position, viz.—baptism is immersion. But while I intend to notice all his arguments, (or rather assertions,) that are entitled to attention, I shall not pursue the same order of arrangement. The first thing is to ascertain the meaning of the Greek word *baptizo*, which has been employed to express the act of baptism. The reader is aware that our translators merely gave this word an English termination—*baptize* instead of *baptizo*. Hence, as they have not translated this word, it becomes necessary to ascertain what meaning the Greeks affix to *baptizo*. And if there were no sectarian prejudices in the way, this might very easily be done. To ascertain the meaning of this word, Mr. F. appeals 1st to the design of Christian baptism. I choose to begin with classic usage.

CHAPTER II.

CLASSIC USAGE.

I begin with Greek classic usage, because this is the *highest* authority. It is ultimate. From this there is no appeal. The 'usus loquendi,' that is, the practical use of a word among the writers and speakers of any language, must determine its meaning. The usage of English writers and speakers must determine the meaning of the English word immersion, in despite of all that dictionaries and lexicographers and critics say on the subject. Indeed, all the authority that the writer of a lexicon, or a dictionary, or a criticism, can claim, must be based on the fact that he has defined words according to their usage among standard authors and good speakers in any given language. Hence Noah Webster has no more authority to append a new definition to the word *immersion*, than any other man. Should he define immerse—to *pour* or *sprinkle*, the definition would not be correct and authentic, because the usus loquendi is against this meaning; and from this there is no appeal. On this just and obvious principle, if a thousand lexicographers and *denominational* critics should assert that baptizo means to pour, or sprinkle, and the usus loquendi is against them—that is, if the Greeks for centuries have used the word to signify immersion and not affusion—the authority of lexicographers and critics cannot justly destroy this definition, because they have failed to perform their appropriate duties, viz. to define the word according to classic usage. Some have supposed that lexicographers control classic usage—whereas classic usage must control lexicographers. Hence, while we consult them as authorities, we should never consider them the highest authorities—for lexicographers and critics, and controversialists on the subject of baptism, must all bow to classic usage as the ultimate authority.

Now I claim that aside from the testimony of lexicographers and critics, the meaning of baptizo is settled *for-*

ever, beyond all necessary dispute, by *Greek classic usage*. The learned Greeks for two thousand years have decided by *usage* that it means to dip, to immerse, and, consequently, it does not mean to pour, nor sprinkle. And it is not possible for our author to shake this authority; as well might he remove the rock of Gibraltar. Learning, ingenuity, sophistry, great names, positive assertions, are all in vain when put in requisition for this purpose. After all such impotent assaults, the simple *authentic* fact that myriads of Greeks, for more than two thousand years, have used the word invariably to signify immersion, and *figuratively* to signify overwhelming or surrounding, stands out in bold relief before the candid and learned world. Before this simple fact, all the arguments of Mr. F. shrink into ‘pompous nothings.’ How vain it would be for a few prejudiced Greeks, for the sake of serving a purpose, to undertake to prove that the English word immersion means to sprinkle, or to pour, when all the nations who use the English language declare that it means to dip, to overwhelm. You perceive, in a moment, how much respect is due to those men who leave the commands of God to practice the traditions of the Elders, when they attempt to deny or overthrow this highest of all authority.

I might safely rest the whole argument here, for I have traced the word to the highest—the ultimate authority. But it seems necessary to notice the sophistry and disprove the unfounded assertions contained in these lectures, and produce some direct and unanswerable proof that my assertion concerning the Greek classic usage is correct. These done, it would seem that no reasonable doubt can linger around the candid mind, which pants for truth on this important and long disputed subject.

The practice of the Greek church is in itself irrefragable proof of my position, that Greek classic *usage* has decided that baptizo means to dip. But Mr. F. insinuates that the testimony of the whole Greek church for eighteen hundred years is not decisive, because ‘that church is in many respects corrupt.’ I answer, if there was not a vestige of Christianity among them, still their

decision about the meaning of baptizo, *one of their own words*, is the highest authority on earth—is *law*. I am sorry that he did not perceive a vast difference between adopting the *religious opinions* of the Greek church, and receiving the Greek definition of a Greek word. I am sure that men who possess the powers of *discrimination*, and are disposed to use them, can easily perceive the distinction. The Greeks have no just authority in matters of Christian *faith*, but they have just authority to impose the meaning of *their own words* on every nation under heaven. English Christians have no right to impose their Theological views on other nations. They do not agree in religious opinion among themselves. Some hold that immersion is baptism, others that affusion is baptism, and some reject water baptism altogether. But with regard to the meaning of their own words, immersion and sprinkling, they have no dispute. They have due authority to define their own words. The Greeks and French and Germans might dispute about our word immersion. The Dutch might say it means ‘to dip.’ Nay, say the Greeks, it means ‘to pour.’ No, say the French, it means ‘to stab.’ And who, in this case, are invested with proper authority to determine the meaning of an English word, and close this debate? Who? why the English, and those who use the English language, *most surely*. If they say it means to dip—to plunge, the point is settled, as from this tribunal there is no appeal. And who will have the folly to demur against this decision? Is it not right in principle and ultimate in authority? It is not every Baptist that can read Greek, or search lexicons, to ascertain the meaning of baptizo; but every Baptist, while he has been led by his English Bible to be ‘buried with Christ by baptism,’ has this honest satisfaction, that he understands Greek just as the Greeks do themselves, so far as baptism is concerned. Of this satisfaction the author cannot bereave us—this authority he labors in vain to destroy. As well might a child attempt to level the Rocky mountains.

2. The Greek church cannot be more corrupt than some of the ignorant and unprincipled Roman Catholic

bishops, which he has quoted to establish matters of religious opinion and practice. I am surprised that he should *summon* as witnesses to prove the right of children to baptism, and also that sprinkling is baptism, men, who held that baptism was regeneration—that without it children must be forever damned,—men, who practiced infant communion, exorcism, and, in short, all the abominable fooleries of the Roman church, and then object against the *decision* of the Greeks about the meaning of their own word, on the ground that the Theology of the Greek church is not sound! I appeal to the world—I appeal to himself—is this consistent, honorable and fair? Does his cause require such a service at his hands?

We will attend, a few moments, to the classic usage of baptizo. We shall discover in the sequel that it has decided the meaning of this word clearly. Of this fact we have sufficient proof in the uniform practice of the Greek church. No man can deny, (without proving his entire want of intelligence or candor,) that the Greeks have from the beginning, in all countries and in all climates, practiced immersion for baptism. But I have other substantial proof that Greek classic usage has decided the meaning of baptizo to be—‘to dip, plunge or immerse into any thing liquid.’

The *numerous* quotations from ancient Greek writers, which have been made by Dr. Ryland of England, Carson of Scotland, and Professor Stuart of our own country, have settled this point, and rendered our ‘assurance doubly sure,’ that it means to immerse, and does not mean to pour or sprinkle. I might here present you with all their selections, but this would occupy much precious time, and it cannot be necessary. I will give you a few instances of the use of baptizo, in which it must appear evident that it means to dip or immerse, and cannot possibly mean to pour or sprinkle. These, together with the accompanying remarks and explicit testimony of Professor Stuart, (a Pædobaptist,) cannot fail to satisfy the candid reader. But, before I proceed, I will notice the attempt of Mr. Fowler to prove from ancient Greek writers that baptizo means to affuse.

On page 26 he quotes, or rather *misquotes* the sybiline verse from Plutarch. (*‘Aschos baptize de toi themis esti.’*) ‘Thou mayest be baptized, O bladder, but it is not permitted to thee to go under the water.’ I reply—he has neither given the original verse, nor a correct translation. He has done great injustice to the meaning of the writer. This verse should have been written and translated thus: (*‘Aschos baptize dunai de toi ou themis esti.’*) O bottle, thou mayest be dipped, but thou art not destined to sink. Or, thou mayest be immersed, O bladder, but thou canst not be kept under water. This language is figurative. Reference is had to a bladder, or leathern bottle. See Donnegan’s Greek lexicon:—‘*Askos*, a wine skin, a bottle of goatskin,’ &c. See also Matt. ix: 17—‘Neither do men put new wine (*eis askous*) into old bottles, but they put new wine (*neon eis askous*) into new bottles, and both are preserved.’ Observe, the wine is not put (*eis*) to the bottles, but (*eis*) into the bottles. A bottle of this kind if empty would float on the surface of the water—if partially filled, it would *dip*, but would not sink to the bottom. Plutarch compared the Athenian state to such a bottle, and meant to say, that although it might be *dipped* or *baptized* or immersed in calamities, yet it should not perish—or sink down to utter destruction. This sentence determines the meaning of baptizo, and shows *conclusively* that it means to dip, and can mean nothing else. We cannot substitute pour, or moisten, or wet, for baptize in this verse, without converting it into nonsense. If Mr. F. should attempt it, he would richly merit the righteous frown of a literary public. I have noticed the following example from Euripides, in Goodrich’s Greek Grammar, page 86, in which bapto is used to express precisely the same thing which baptizo does in the above passage from Plutarch: ‘A ship, with its sheet anchor stretched, is apt to dip, (*ebapsen*,) but rises again (*este*) if one relaxes the sheet.’

2. He calls our attention to Judith xii: 7, where it is said that Judith ‘went out in the night and baptized (*ebaptizeto*) herself in the camp, at the fountain of water.’ ‘The circumstances of this case forbid the idea that

Judith plunged herself into the fountain of water.' Let us attend to this a moment. It is not claimed that she plunged headlong into the *fountain*. But I contend that it should have been translated—'she dipped herself.' For this is the meaning of the word, and nothing in the circumstances of the case, when candidly and critically examined, forbid the idea of immersion, or require us to seek for any other than the ordinary and prevailing signification of the word. I will here refer you to the language of Professor Ripley. "There surely may have been conveniences for bathing the whole person 'at the fountain' in the immediate vicinity of it, and conveniences which were supplied with water from the fountain. If such accommodations were not provided for the use of the army, yet it should be remembered that there were in the immediate vicinity of Bethulia, where the army was encamped, several fountains belonging to the city; and that the one here spoken of was a peculiarly important one, from which 'all the inhabitants of Bethulia' obtained their water; (chap. vii: 7th compared with 13, 10.) Is it unlikely that a Jewish city, thus furnished with natural supplies of water, would also be furnished at the fountain, or fountains, with artificial accommodations for bathing? Granting, however, the probability of this, it may be asked, is it probable that a female—a Jewish female, would bathe or immerse herself 'in the midst of the camp'? Perhaps not. But then it is nowhere in the book of Judith intimated that the action was performed 'in the midst of the camp.' All parts of a camp are not equally exposed; and the place to which she resorted seems to have been chosen, because, among other reasons, it was somewhat retired. She went to that place habitually for *special prayer* and purification; and the bathing or immersion was a religious service, (xi: 17, xii: 9, xii: 7, xiii: 10.) The place, though within the precincts of the camp, yet might have been far 'from the midst of it'; this, chapter xiii: 10, 11, seems to intimate. Besides, this religious ceremony was performed in the night; and she was doubtless accompanied by the maid-servant whom she took with her on her adventurous expedition, (x: 5,

10.) She is represented as remarkable for her piety and her confidence in the divine protection; and, besides, Holofernes, the general of the army, had taken her under his special protection, and had given orders that no one should interfere with her movements; (xii. 6, 7.) There is nothing, then, in the circumstances of this case, which forbids us to believe that Judith did actually immerse or bathe her whole person. The ceremony could be performed with perfect safety, and without any sacrifice of delicacy. If the writer intended to convey the thought that she did thus immerse herself, the language he has employed was adapted to convey that thought. It is certainly, then, the dictate of propriety to assign to the word in this place its ordinary signification, rather than by the unfounded apprehension of impossibility, or indelicacy, to determine that it cannot have that meaning."* I will only add, every candid man, who is acquainted with oriental customs, will acknowledge the propriety of the above remarks. It may seem strange to us that a female should go out in the night to pray, and immerse or baptize herself in water—but this was done in a land of ablutions, and these immersions were common. To argue as Mr. F. does in this case, is to reason, as he usually does on this subject, without first principles. He takes it for granted, and roundly asserts that a thing is impossible, which is so far from being impossible that it is not even *improbable*. Were this a lawful mode of reasoning, it would be easy to disprove every thing.

3. Mr. Fowler says that Mr. Pond says that Tertullian said, 'speaking of a man who had been baptized, who will accommodate you, a man whose penitence is so little to be trusted, with one sprinkling of water (*asperginem unam aquæ*)?' Now one would suppose that evidence which had come such a distance, and by such a zigzag course, must be worth something on its arrival; but I ask, what,

*The Jews—says Spencer, in his elaborate work on the ritual laws of the Hebrews—when about to perform their vows, sometimes bathed the whole body in a bath. I gather from the history of Judith that she baptized herself in a fountain of water.—See *Ripley on Baptism*, page 29.

in the name of wonder, did he expect to do with this witness? The business on hand was 'to show the import of baptizo, *as used by Greek writers.*' But Tertullian was a *Latin* Father—the sentence is a Latin sentence, selected from a Latin book. Has much learning made Mr. Fowler mad, so that he cannot distinguish between Latin and Greek? But the sentence, if admitted, proves nothing. There is no more meaning in it than there is in the text, which a certain eccentric minister once selected from the New Testament, 'top not come down.' Observe, the man spoken of 'had been baptized.' The question was, 'who will accommodate you with one sprinkling of water?' I can see no meaning in the passage, unless it be that the man was so vile a wretch, that, although he had once been baptized, (that is, *immersed three times*—for that was baptism in Tertullian's day,) yet he was so unworthy *now*, that, so far from consenting to baptize him, they would not even sprinkle him—though that would be only mocking the subject of baptism. It is not true that 'this shows the opinion of Tertullian, nor that sprinkling was then practiced in the church.' These are perfectly *gratuitous* and utterly *baseless* assertions.

4. He says that Origen 'represented the wood on the altar, upon which water was poured at the command of Elijah, (1st Kings, xviii: 33,) as having been baptized.' 'This baptism was performed by pouring—this none can doubt. And thus we have the opinion and use of Origen that baptizo means affusion.' The sum of this testimony is, that Dr. Wall says that Origen considered the few sticks of wood, on which twelve barrels of water had been poured, as *baptized*. Very well. I have no objection to this sentiment. For, in the first place, Matthew Henry, a Pædobaptist commentator, says, (*in loco*) 'Some suppose this altar was hollow'; if so, there was a literal immersion of the wood. But if not, the wood must have been as completely wet as if it had been plunged into water. And, by a mode of expression common to most languages, it would be natural to say, the wood was bathed or immersed in water. Take the word dip—we all know its meaning. 'A cold, shuddering dew dips me all over.'

The mind plays with delight between the original literal meaning of the word and its figurative application. But this does not alter the meaning of the word dip. Mr. F. would expose himself to the censure of the literary public as a superficial critic, should he say, that in the above passage of Milton, affusion is the meaning of the word dip; or should he assert that we have here the opinion of Milton that dip means affusion. Yet, on the same principles, and for the same reasons, he has said that pouring is baptism, and that this is the opinion of Origen. It is not true that we have here the opinion of Origen—he does not say that pouring is baptism—he has not intimated any such thing. The pouring for baptism is all in the imagination of Mr. F. not in the passage of Origen. Besides, the opinion does not rest on any principle of philology, whoever may adopt and proclaim it. The statement is, that water was poured on the wood, and that the wood was baptized. So, then, says Mr. F., baptism is pouring. Well, then, if pouring is baptism, no matter whether the water was poured on the wood, or on the ground—there is just as much pouring in one case as in the other—and, if pouring is baptism, there is as much baptism in one case as the other. No, says our author, here is evidence sufficient to convince every body that baptism is pouring, because the water is poured. To this I shall attend in another place. I will only say, that, in the very next sentence, the author labors to prove that baptism is sprinkling. In the conclusion he says, ‘the water of baptism is here represented as *falling* like dew.’ Well, then, according to his reasoning, baptism is *falling*.. This *no man can doubt!* Now do not turn away, Mr. F., with an air of dignified importance, and say, ‘this is ridicule and vulgarity’; for every child that is capable of comparing two oranges together, can understand your rule, and will justify my remark. Nothing is more simple than this—‘In baptism the water is poured, therefore, baptism is pouring’; on the same principle, ‘in baptism the water comes by falling, therefore, baptism is falling.’ Is not this logic most acute, this reasoning most profound? It is no wonder that the man who uses it

should talk about the 'semblance of argument' in the writings of others. However, if Mr. F. insists upon it, he can place his candidate in a tank, or bath, and 'pour twelve barrels of water' upon him, and call it baptism. But we think his candidate will hardly allow that this process ought to be called 'affusion.' And we think, also, that the better way would be to take his subject and 'go down into the water and baptize him,' and then come up out of the water,' as did John and the apostles and primitive administrators.

5. His other citations, under the head of ancient Greek writers are absolutely unworthy of notice. He refers to Lactantius, another *Latin Father*, to show us the meaning of this word with Greek writers! I shall, of course, be excused by a generous public if I do not examine thoroughly and answer formally an *unmeaning* half sentence in Latin. Besides, I have as yet no substantial proof that this sentence was ever written by Lactantius. And if it were, what is there in this language which favors the cause of Mr. F.? 'That he might save the Gentiles by baptism, that is, by the distilling of the purifying dew.' This is the language of his witness verbatim. Now what does it prove? Can any mortal tell? Does it prove that God saves the Gentiles by water baptism? Is water sprinkled a purifying dew? The sentiment is too absurd to be indulged a moment. It cannot be that Mr. F. is about to take his stand with the poor African Fidus and assert that baptism saves the soul. If this is not the meaning of the above language, then it is utterly devoid of meaning. Suppose I should quote from the Old Testament this passage—'four at the causeway and two at parbor,'—to prove that Greek writers use baptizo to signify dipping! would it not be as much in point?

6. He gives the opinion of Cyprian upon a text of scripture. But as I am not dealing in opinions, but inquiring after facts, I let this pass. It has no bearing on the question before us. It is simply the opinion of Cyprian that the text in Ezekiel xxxvi: 25, 'I will sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean,' referred to Christian baptism. Although this opinion is not entitled

to notice here, yet as the author quotes this passage repeatedly to prove that sprinkling is baptism, I will just observe, it appears strange to me that Cyprian or any other man should ever have embraced or promulgated such an opinion. It evinces either a want of attention to the subject, or the most unjustifiable prejudice in favor of a darling practice. For, in the first place, sprinkling is nowhere in the Bible called baptism. Second, Old Testament prophets had nothing to say or do in regulating New Testament ordinances. Third, the opinion regards baptism as a saving ordinance. 'I will sprinkle clean water upon you, and *ye shall be clean.*' Does any one believe that baptism cleanses the soul from all filthiness and all idols? These were the effects of the sprinkling referred to in the text. Surely this is not the work of men, but of the holy and powerful Lord God. And the apostle has said, that baptism is not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience. And, finally, the *context* utterly destroys this opinion at once. God said by the prophet to his people who were in captivity because of their sins, 'I will sprinkle clean water upon you and ye shall be clean.' They well understood the idea of ceremonial purification by the sprinkling of blood, which prefigured, not the water of baptism, but 'the precious blood of Christ.' The meaning was, 'through that blood which is typified by the blood which you have seen sprinkled in the temple, and by my grace, I will sprinkle your hearts, and wean you from your idols.' And what more did he promise them? Why, '*ye shall dwell in the land that I gave to your fathers*'; and ye shall be my people and I will be your God'; (29th verse.) If this referred to baptism, then all who are sprinkled will certainly inherit the land of Canaan; for the promise is absolute and unconditional! Strange that men will suffer their prejudices to carry them away into captivity. The man who can adopt this opinion, after due examination of the subject, could receive the doctrine of transubstantiation, if it were but popular. In fact, the latter does not propose a greater insult to the Bible, nor to the understanding of man, than does the former.

7. To return. The author concludes by citing several authors who speak of 'baptism in *tears* and blood.' It will, of course, be admitted that the word baptizo in these cases is used figuratively. To substitute pour or sprinkle for baptism in these passages, would be to destroy all their force, and divest them of all their beauty. When we can understand the expressions 'overwhelmed in calamity,' 'immersed in debt,' 'plunged in sorrow,' 'bathed in tears,' (and every good linguist can and does understand them,) we can understand the meaning of 'baptized in tears,' 'baptized in blood.' It certainly does not mean to be *sprinkled* nor *poured* in blood. 'The martyrs were *plunged* in sorrow and *immersed* in blood,' is a soul-thrilling sentence. 'The martyrs were *poured* in *calamities*, and affused *with sorrows*, and sprinkled *in blood*,' is forceless, tasteless, insipid. It would degrade the composition of any clergyman in New England. Says Stuart, pages 310, 311, 'So the classic usage—to overwhelm with misfortunes, with taxes, with wine, with questions, with debt, with excessive labor, etc. etc.' 'Inasmuch now as the *more usual* idea (he speaks with great caution) of baptizo is that of *overwhelming* or *immerging*, it was very natural to employ it in designating severe calamities and sufferings." Thus you see that Professor Stuart fully justifies my view of this subject. And every *candid* scholastic man is compelled to acknowledge that when baptizo is thus used figuratively, it conveys the idea of immersion. Thus our Saviour was baptized—that is, he endured 'sufferings of an *overwhelming* and dreadful nature,' says Stuart. He was '*plunged* into the most *overwhelming* distress,' says Doddridge. 'He calls his sufferings by a name that mitigates them; it is a *baptism*, not a deluge; I must be *dipped* in them, not drowned in them.'—(*Henry in loco.*) Thus you see that Mr. F. dissents from his most learned and candid brethren when he says that 'baptism in blood means affusion.' On this subject he surely deserves the honor of standing alone. I do not believe that either of the clergymen who recommended his lectures will agree with him on this topic. And if they do, their authority

cannot overturn the well known and long established laws of language.

I rejoice that Mr. F. appears to have relinquished the preposterous and degrading sentiment that Christ was baptized by a 'literal sprinkling in sweat and blood.' For the same reason precisely, let him give up the absurd idea that affusion is intended in the passages under consideration.

This attempt to prove from ancient Greek writers that baptizo means to pour or sprinkle, is worse than an entire failure. For he has not produced a single sentence which favors 'affusion.' Some of his witnesses testify against him, and all of them show that his cause derives no support from classic usage. And yet he seems to congratulate himself as a reasoner, and on page 38, after throwing together a huge mass of assertions, not one of which has yet been proved, and, what is more, not one of which *admits* of proof, with much self-complacency he comes to this triumphant conclusion, 'The views of the mode of baptism we advocate are placed upon an immovable basis'!

I will now see if I cannot find a nobler basis than *unproved assertion*, on which to found my position that baptizo, with ancient Greek writers, means 'to plunge, to dip, to immerge, to sink.' I will refer first to Professor Stuart's testimony, and to some of the sentences from Greek writers which confirm his opinion.

He says, page 298 and onward:—

"Bapto and baptizo mean to dip, plunge, or immerge, into any thing liquid. All lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this. My proof of this position, then, need not necessarily be protracted; but for the sake of ample confirmation, I must beg the reader's patience while I lay before him, as briefly as may be, the results of an investigation, which seems to leave no room for doubt. Take the following from the classics:

1. Homer, Od. 1, 392. As when a smith dips or plunges (*baptei*) a hatchet or huge pole-axe into cold water, viz. to harden them. Here is no room to doubt the meaning of bapto. We cannot, of course, pour or sprin-

kle an axe into water. It must be dip or plunge. But we will confine our examination to *baptizo*.

2. Pindar, Pyth. 2, 139, describes the impotent malice of his enemies by representing himself to be like the cork upon a net in the sea, which does not sink : ‘As when a net is cast into the sea the cork swims above, so I am unplunged (*abaptistos*) ;’ on which the Greek scholiast in commenting, says, ‘As the cork (*ou dunei*) does not sink, so I am (*abaptistos*) unplunged, not immersed.’ The cork remains (*abaptistos*) and swims on the surface of the sea, being of a nature which is *abaptistos* ; in like manner I am *abaptistos*. The frequent repetition of the same words and sentiments in this scholion, shews, in all probability, that it is compiled from different annotators upon the text. But the sense of *baptizo* in all is too clear to admit of any doubt.” No Baptist testimony is needed here.

3. Heraclides Ponticus, a disciple of Aristotle, says : ‘When a piece of iron is taken red hot from the fire and plunged in the water (*udati baptizetai*), the heat, being quenched by the peculiar nature of the water, ceases.’ Surely we cannot affuse, nor pour, nor sprinkle a red hot iron into *water* ! It must be dip or immerse.

4. Plutarch tells us of a general, who, “dipping his hand into blood (*eis to aima . . . baptizas*), wrote this inscription, &c. ;’ pouring and sprinkling cannot be substituted here for dipping. Again, same author :

5 ‘Plunge (*baptison*) yourself into the sea.’ How is it possible for a man to sprinkle or pour himself into the sea. Again, same author :

6. ‘Then plunging (*baptison*) himself into the lake Copais.’ This cannot be affusion.

7. Lucian vol. I, page 139, represents Timon, the man-hater, as saying : ‘If a winter’s flood should carry away any one, and he, stretching out his hands, should beg for help, I would press down the head of such an one when sinking (*baptizonta*), so that he could not rise up again.’ Can a man plunge so deep into sprinkling as to drown ? If so, I exhort Mr. Fowler to beware ! But I will not ‘press down his head’ ; I hope he will yet arise out of affusion.

8. Diodorus Siculus, edit. Heyne 4, page 118. Whose ship being sunk or merged (*baptistheises*), some other editions read (*Buthistheises*), plunged into the deep, which is a good gloss. It would be impossible to merge or sink a ship by affusion.

9. Epictetus says, 'As you would not wish, sailing in a large ship adorned and abounding in gold, to be sunk or immersed (*baptizesthai*), so, &c.'

10. Hippocrates says, 'shall I not laugh at the man who sinks (*baptizonta*) his ship by overlading it,' &c. No sprinkling yet. Professor Stuart says, page 300, that *bapto* and *baptizo* are used by Hippocrates in his book, to signify dipping or plunging, in instances almost without number. Hippocrates was the most eminent of ancient physicians, and is considered the father of medical science.—See *Davenport's Biographical Dict.*

11. Strabo, lib. 6, page 421, speaking of a lake near Agrigentum, says, 'things that elsewhere cannot float, do not sink (*me baptizesthai*) in the water of this lake, but swim in the manner of wood.'

12. Lib. 12, page 809. 'If one shoots an arrow into the channel, (of a certain rivulet in Cappadocia,) the force of the water resists it so much that it will scarcely plunge in (*baptizesthai*).'

13. Lib. 14, page 942. 'They (the soldiers) marched a whole day through the water—plunged in (*baptizomenon*) up to the waist.'

14. Lib. 16, page 1108. 'The bitumen floats on the top (of the lake Sirbon) because of the nature of the water, which admits of no diving, nor can any one who enters it plunge in (*baptizesthai*), but is borne up.' Can obstinacy itself deny that in all these instances *baptizo* signifies to dip, plunge or immerse? Surely it does not mean *to affuse*.

After these references, with others to the same effect, which I have not quoted, Professor Stuart, on page 300, comes to this conclusion: 'It were easy to enlarge this list of testimonies to classic usage, but the reader will not desire it. He may see many examples in Carson's recent publication on baptism, which I did not see until after the

present dissertation was written. It is impossible to doubt that the words *bapto* and *baptizo* have in Greek classical writers the sense of *dip*, *plunge*, *immerge*, *sink*, *etc.*'

Now observe ; we have the plain, positive declaration of Stuart, that all lexicographers and critics of any note are agreed in this, that *baptizo* means to dip, plunge or immerse, into any thing liquid. Does he understand this subject ? If he does not, what Pædobaptist in New England will give him instruction ? He has devoted much time to this examination. He is a scholar, or he would not have been placed at the head of that seminary which is the grand focus of Congregationalism in America. He has in his hands all the necessary means of information. Would he be likely, as a practical Pædobaptist, to admit any thing in favor of Baptist views without substantial reasons ?

Again, he has given us several explicit testimonies from Greek classic usage, fourteen of which I have quoted, which prove conclusively that *baptizo* means to dip or immerge, and which cannot mean to pour nor sprinkle. Is there not point and force to these testimonies ? Do they not outweigh the mere *ipse dixit* of any man on this subject ? Will not this appeal to the highest authority satisfy every candid mind ? If not, whither shall we go for *honest satisfaction* in the case ?

But does not Professor Stuart show that Greek classical writers use *baptizo* to signify pouring or sprinkling ? No. He has too much intelligence and candor to do this. He has not produced from the Greek classics a single instance in which they used the word to signify any thing like pouring or sprinkling.

I sincerely regret that Mr. F., by misrepresenting Prof. Stuart, and by charging this same fault on me,—(for his remarks were evidently aimed at me,)—has rendered it necessary to refute the charge, and show that *in fact* he has not treated Stuart fairly himself. This is certainly not a pleasant but painful task. Still I believe it is a duty which I owe to the cause of truth and to myself. I have not intentionally misrepresented Stuart, nor do I be-

lieve that it can be made to appear that I have done it. I should be very glad to meet Mr. F. with our writings and the treatise of this Professor in hand, and examine this matter before any intelligent and candid assembly, and let the public decide who has misrepresented Stuart,—the author of these lectures, or myself. He says in his appendix, page 116, ‘That Prof. Stuart affirms, page 308, that *bapto* and especially *baptizo* have other meanings, viz. to wash, to bedew or moisten, which he says are more clearly and fully exhibited.’ Now this is not correct. Stuart does not *say* this—nor *mean* this on page 308, nor anywhere else.* I appeal to the book itself. I am sorry that Mr. F. could not read correctly, and represent fairly, the testimony of his own brother. I could not quote all his book, when I referred to his writings—but I am willing to hear and examine and answer all that he has said on baptism.

He does say on page 308, after his examination of the Greek classics, ‘That in searching after the meaning of these words, as used in the Apocrypha and the Septuagint, *baptizo* signifies *to wash or cleanse in water*; *bapto* sometimes signifies to moisten, bedew or wet.’ And 3d, he throws these two words *bapto* and *baptizo* together, and observes, that in the Septuagint and Apocrypha the reader will perceive that ‘some of the *classical* meanings of these words are not to be found, while other meanings, viz. to wash, bedew or moisten, are more clearly and fully exhibited.’ That is, as in the examples above, *baptizo—to wash*, and *bapto—to bedew or moisten*. But Mr. F. gives a very different idea in his quotation. In direct contradiction to S. he says, ‘*baptizo*’ especially means to bedew or wet. Again, Stuart speaks of meanings ‘more

*On reviewing Stuart’s treatise, I perceive that he has said, page 118, ‘Both the classic use and that of the Septuagint shew that washing and copious affusion are sometimes signified by this word (*baptizo*.’) But this must be a mistake—because he has given no examples from ‘classic use’, nor from the ‘Septuagint’, which go to prove it. And because it contradicts what he says elsewhere, I conclude with Prof. Ripley, that ‘Stuart probably had his mind while writing this sentence upon the definitions which he had himself ascribed to *bapto*’. At any rate the statement is not correct. To say the least, it wants proof.

clearly and fully exhibited'; that is, in the Septuagint and Apocrypha they are more fully exhibited than in the Greek classics. Whereas Mr. F. makes him say that these meanings were more fully exhibited than the meaning 'to dip, plunge, immerge, sink, &c.' This is a total perversion of Stuart's meaning; and yet every reader will naturally receive the idea that this was what he meant to say, viz. that bedewing and wetting are meanings of baptizo more clearly exhibited in the Greek classic writers than dipping or plunging. Such a sentiment is a *libel* on Prof. Stuart's treatise, as every one knows who has ever read the work.

I do not agree with Stuart that bapto signifies to moisten or bedew—but as the word has nothing to do with our present inquiry, I leave it. I have heretofore supposed that one of the definitions of bapto which has commonly been given, viz. 'to wet or bedew', was correct, and gave it thus in my address—but a more thorough investigation of the subject has satisfied my mind that classic usage will not justify this definition. Nor do I believe that baptizo ever *strictly* means to wash. I shall give my reasons.

Prof. Stuart says, page 300, 'There are some variations from this *prevailing* signification (dipping); that is, shades of meaning kindred to this, as it happens with most words.' This I admit. Take our modal word *dip*: a man may be dipped in water, or he may dip into business, or science, or pleasure, or trouble—but this does not alter the meaning of the word *dip*. 'Baptizo means to wash,' it is said. How is it proved? Prof. Stuart has referred to Judith xii: 7. This we have already examined; I think the reader will perceive that the example does not support this definition. He refers to the case of Naaman, the Assyrian leper. He was directed to wash, and he went and dipped himself in Jordan.—2d Kings, v: 14. This does not prove that dipping is washing, nor that baptizo means *to wash*. But two things it does prove. 1st. That to wash, in the scriptural import of that term, is sometimes equivalent to dipping. This I hope will be remembered. 2. That the words *dip* and *wash* may be used interchange-

ably, and yet retain their own peculiar meanings. Who will contend that to dip means to wash—that one is the definition of the other? It is contended that baptizo means to wash, and as this is the very example selected by Prof. Stuart and others to prove the point, I solicit special attention to the following remarks.

“ Here bathing in a river is called baptism. What more do we want, then, to teach us the mode of this ordinance of Christ? If there was not another passage of scripture to throw light on the institution, so far as it respects mode, is not this, to every teachable mind, perfectly sufficient? But it seems we are crying victory before the field is won. This passage, which we think so decisive, has a far different aspect to others. On the contrary it is made to afford evidence against us. Well, this is strange indeed; but ingenuity has many shifts. Let us see how artifice can involve the passage in a cloud. Nothing is more easy. Does not the prophet command Naaman to *wash*; if, then, he obeyed this command by *baptizing* himself, *baptizing* must signify *washing*. For the sake of argument I will grant this reasoning for a moment. If, then, this is so, go, my brethren, and wash the person to be baptized as you think Naaman washed himself, from head to foot. This will show that you respect the example. In what manner soever the water was applied to Naaman, he was bathed all over. If the word signifies to wash the whole body, who but the Pope himself would take on him to substitute the sprinkling of a few drops of water in the place of this universal washing? But I do not admit the reasoning, that, from this passage, concludes that baptizo means to wash, although no instance can be produced more plausible in favor of that opinion. This passage is a complete illustration of my rule. The two words *louo* and *baptizo* are here used interchangeably, yet they are not of the same signification. ‘Not of the same signification!’ it may be asked with surprise. Elisha commands him to wash; he obeys by baptizing himself; must not then baptizing be washing? I think none of my opponents will wish a stronger statement of their objection than I have made for them. But my doctrine remains unin-

jured by the assault. The true philologist will not find the smallest difficulty in reconciling this passage to it. The words *louo* and *baptizo* have their own peculiar meanings here even, as well as every where else, without the least confusion. To baptize is not wash ; but to baptize *in a river* or *in pure water* implies washing, and may be used for it in certain situations. If Naaman *dipped* himself in Jordan he was *washed*. It comes to the same thing, whether a physician says, bathe yourself every morning in the sea, or dip yourself every morning in the sea, yet the words *bathe* and *dip* do not signify the same thing. We see, then, that we can make the same use of our modal word *dip*, which the Greeks made of their *baptizo*. No man who understands English, will say that the word *dip* and the word *bathe* signify the same thing, yet in certain situations they may be used indifferently. Persons at a bath may ask each other, Did you dip this morning ? or, Did you bathe this morning ? To dip may apply to the defiling of anything as well as to washing. It expresses no more than the mode. It is the situation in which it stands, and the word with which it is construed, that determine the object of the application of the mode. To dip in pure water is to wash ; to dip in coloring is to dye ; to dip into mire is to defile. None of these ideas, however, are in the *word dip* itself. No word could determine mode according to the principles of criticism employed by writers on this subject.

The error in this criticism is this. It supposes that if in any circumstances two words can be used interchangeably, they must signify the same thing ; and that controversialists are at liberty to reciprocate their meanings as often as the necessity of their cause demands it. This is a source of error more fruitful in false criticism than any other of its numerous resources.* We may say dip the bread in wine, or moisten the bread in wine. But does this prove that to dip is to moisten ? Certainly not. And yet there is a speciousness in this false criticism, which imposes on most false reasoners. This is the stumbling-

* See Carson on Baptism.

stone not of Mr. F. only, but of lexicographers and critics and commentators generally; and it seems that Professor Stuart has not been sufficiently guarded on this point. A *mere shadow* has been adopted in this case, as a *first principle*.

This principle of false criticism unfolds the mystery at once, why 'baptizo' should have twenty, thirty, or even fifty meanings. Here is the whole process: To baptize means to dip—but to baptize *may* mean to wash. To wash—may mean a partial application of water to any part of the body—in washing the hands water is sometimes poured, therefore to baptize means to pour. Again to dip may mean to wash. To wash—is to purify. To purify, under the law of Moses—signified the sprinkling of sacrificial blood, therefore, to dip means to sprinkle!—How easy it would be on this principle of false criticism to fritter away the meaning of any word in any language, To all this sophistical trifling—it is sufficient to say by way of enquiry—is the man who has plunged into a ditch and is dipped in mire—cleansed, or purified, or poured, or sprinkled by such an operation? If not, any man may see, if he will, that to wash, and pour and sprinkle, are not the definitions of baptizo.

Whoever examines this subject critically, will perceive that lexicographers and critics have taken unwarrantable license in affixing meanings to baptizo. Mr. F. has referred to *dupto*, as a word of invariable signification. But *dupto* is not more unequivocal in its definition than baptizo, or the English word dip. *They* may, by the adoption of this false principle, in the same way be pared and mangled and divided and sub-divided, until nothing remains but 'fifty meanings,' which taken altogether, mean precisely nothing. Besides, 'dupto' does not appear to be the appropriate word to express immersion. By tracing it to its root, it will be seen that it comes from '*dup-tes*,' a diver. Says Carson, "it may seem strange that the most learned men should be imposed upon in this matter; and with respect to words which they find in use in what they read, think they have meanings which they have not. But a little consideration of the nature of the

mistake will explain this matter. I admit that the meaning which they take out of the word is always implied in the passage where the word occurs; but I deny that the meaning is expressed by the word. It is always made out by implication." To baptize and to wash—or to dip and to wash may be used interchangeably—but each of these words has its own distinctive or peculiar meaning: hence it is rash and unphilosophical to say that wash is the meaning of baptizo. For this reason I do not concur with Prof. Stuart. The examples he has quoted do not sustain him in his position. He says, page 313, concerning baptizo, "Possibly (but not probably) it may mean copiously moistening or bedewing; because words coming from the same common root, '*bap*,' are applied in both these senses."

But this is not saying that '*baptizo* means affusions.' He says possibly, but not probably it *may* mean *copiously bedewing*, &c. But we want to know *not* what this word *may possibly but not probably mean*—but what it does mean, *positively and certainly*. He has told us that it is *impossible* to doubt that it means 'to dip, plunge or immerge.' All that can be made of his opinion with regard to affusion, is, that there exists a mere *possibility* that it *may* mean copiously bedewing; and this mere 'possibility' is based on the sand. 'Words coming from the same common root *bap* are applied in both these senses.' This assertion has not yet been proved by any decisive and certain examples: and if it were proved, the meaning of other words can have no influence on the classic use of baptizo. Mr. F. represents Prof. Stuart as saying that "none of the Bible evidence which he had examined proves immersion to have been exclusively the mode of Christian baptism," &c. I am sorry to say this is not correct. He says "I do consider it as quite plain that none of the *circumstantial* evidence thus far proves immersion to have been *exclusively* the mode of Christian baptism, or even that of John. Now I ask, does not the phrase 'Bible evidence' strike the mind very differently from *circumstantial evidence*? I am very willing to believe that this error was the offspring of

inadvertence; but I am sorry that Mr. F. was not more guarded while administering reproof for the sin of misrepresenting Prof. Stuart.

What if the *circumstances* connected with baptism, as described in the New Testament do not prove conclusively that immersion was always practiced? Is it at all necessary that they should? Was this to be expected from the nature of the case? Have we not an ample supply of positive evidence on this point? Besides, Prof. S. says on the same page, with regard to the circumstances of baptism, "I find none I am quite ready to concede, which seems absolutely to determine that immersion was not practiced."

Mr. F. says that those who have misrepresented Prof. Stuart, in their 'efforts betray feelings which no candid man can possess.' Is there any man living who merits the application of this language more than himself? The truth is, there is more similarity between Prof. Stuart's views on this subject and my own, than there is between his views and those of Mr. Fowler. But perhaps you enquire, why does Prof. S. continue the practice of sprinkling, after these generous and candid concessions? This I confess is to me a little mysterious. The first time I read his treatise on baptism, and noticed his profound research, his assiduity as a scholar, his ingenuousness as the organ of Congregationalism, and his candor as a reasoner, as I came to the conclusion of the work—I could but exclaim with Paul, 'Ye *did* run well, who did hinder you, that you should not *obey* the truth?'

But what I am particularly grieved to notice in Mr. F., and some few of the 'advocates of affusion,' is, they are not willing to admit plain and well-established facts, viz. that the obvious and prevailing signification of baptizo is to dip, to immerse, and that immersion was the practice of the primitive church. If they were all as candid as are those who belong to the most *learned* and *numerous* and generous class of *Pædobaptists* who admit these truths, and would say as *they* do, that 'baptism is an external rite, and that mode is not essential—then, every man could judge for himself, whether it was prudent and pious to alter the

laws of Christ's kingdom with regard to 'external ordinances.' I think not. But in the above case we know what ground is taken, and there is no deception: Whereas to pretend that the word means pouring and sprinkling and purifying and wetting and bedewing, and forty other things—and that sprinkling has always been considered valid baptism—is to deceive honest, but uninformed minds.

To return to our subject, the classic usage of baptizo. We have noticed the use of this word by several of the Greek classics, and we have heard the full and pointed testimony of Prof. Stuart, who says that 'it is impossible to doubt' that in the classics 'it has the sense of dip, plunge, immerse, sink, &c.' Let any man in New England disprove this testimony, if he can, by an appeal to ancient Greek writers. But this cannot be done. No man of candor and science will ever attempt it. Yet as classic usage is the grand pivot on which this controversy turns, I bespeak the reader's patience, while I present a few more evidences from this authentic and decisive source.

Mr. F. may appear to be '*maximus in minimis*,' (very great in little things,) while counting and balancing Greek prepositions—watering his "camels and horses and asses at Enon"—holding 'camp-meetings at P.'—and summoning as his witnesses denominational critics and Roman Catholic Bishops (Bishops whom he would disdain to set with the dogs of his flock, when baptism is out of sight. But these musketoe arguments can never settle this controversy. If this is ever accomplished, (and I pray God that it may be soon) it must be done by an appeal to impartial and ultimate authority. Prof. Stuart says, p. 384. 'I have found, in a recent publication by the Rev. A. Carson of Edinburgh, * * * * many useful and striking remarks on the classical use of bapto and baptizo, and the distinction made between them by classical usage.'

To some of these 'useful and striking remarks,' or rather proofs, of Mr. Carson, I now solicit the attention of my reader. He has taken and fully sustained this position: "Bapto, the primitive word, has two significations; the primary to dip, the secondary to dye. Baptizo is

formed to modify the primary only, and invariably signifies to dip or plunge.' He challenges the literary world to produce in all the Greek classics an instance in which it has necessarily any other meaning. He writes from the vicinity of Edinburgh University, the *focus* of science. He is acknowledged to be one of the best scholars in Europe. If baptizo is not used by Greek writers to signify dipping, or immersing, it will be easy for the learned Pædobaptists in America or Europe to disprove his assertions, and show, that among the Greeks this word means to pour or sprinkle. If it does mean to dip or plunge, in the writings of the Greek classics, the point is settled, and there is no need of further debate on this subject. Quibbling and vexatious dispute are altogether useless. My quotations must be few, compared with the vast number before me. These shall relate to the word baptizo, as this is the word used to express the ordinance of baptism.

1. Polybus, vol. 3d, p. 311, applies the word to soldiers passing through the water immersed (*baptizomenoi*) up to the breast. Here surely the word cannot mean pouring or sprinkling.

2d. Diodorus Siculus, speaking of the sinking of animals in water, says, that when the water overflows, 'many of the land animals (*baptizomena*) immersed in the river, perish.' Surely this baptism was immersion. The sinking of animals is here called baptism. What then is baptism but immersion? Upon the principle of giving secondary meanings to words, drown might be given as an additional meaning of baptizo, from the authority of this passage. As the animals were *drowned* by immersion, this immersion might be called drowning.' On the same principle, because washing is sometimes the effect of baptism, *baptism* is *washing*! Who does not see that this is illogical. Is this practice of giving out new meanings based on any correct principle of philology?

3d. The sinner is represented by Porphyry (p. 288) as baptized up to his head (*baptizesti mekri kephales*) in Styx, a celebrated river in hell.' Is there any question about the mode of this baptism.

4th. Mr. Carson, after quoting three striking examples from Strabo, which are directly to the point, says: 'Here is mode and nothing but mode. It is immersion and nothing but immersion. Sprinkling and pouring, popping and dropping—wetting and washing, embuing and dedicating, devoting and consecrating, with all the various meanings that have ever been forced upon this word were invented merely to serve a purpose. It may as well be said that sprinkling and pouring is diving and sinking, as that it is baptism.'

I will only add, that classic usage will unquestionably sustain him in these remarks. He has shown that the sinking of an arrow is called baptism. Therefore if sprinkling is baptism by the common rule sprinkling is sinking! Is it not absurd for men to spend their time, exhaust their energies, and rack all their invention to prove that baptizo means to sprinkle? If they attempt the work they had better not resort to classic usage, but like Mr. F. rely on the authority of great names and put into circulation the positive but unfounded assertions of men, who have given proof to the world that they had less discrimination and more prejudice than they had learning.

Does the candid reader believe that it is in fact so very difficult to ascertain the meaning of baptizo as some men seem to imagine? Can he believe that this word has twenty, thirty, or even fifty meanings, all equally valid and valuable? Have not men been led to such a conclusion by inattention to the laws of true criticism? If this theory be true, what, I ask, can be certainly known about the great principles of Christianity itself? Are we not involved in distressing and perpetual uncertainty on every subject which challenges our notice? But, blessed be God, there is meaning in words, which may be ascertained by the humble, teachable mind, that thirsts for truth and cries after wisdom. It is only on subjects around which party feeling and sectarian prejudice have thrown their 'sombre shades,' that men are in doubt. Mr. Fowler, on page 26, has given us a long story about the *generic* and *specific* meanings of words, and illustrated his ingenious theory by several examples. To all this it is

enough to say, that his remarks amount to nothing in this case, because baptizo is not a generic word; and its specific meaning is to dip. It is as much the modal word in the Greek language, as dip or plunge in ours. I call on Mr. F. to disprove this assertion, if he can, by appealing to the legitimate authority—classic usage.

5. Themistius, orat. 4, page 133, says, ‘The pilot cannot tell but he may save one in the voyage that had better be drowned, (*baptisai*) sunk in the sea.’ Such a baptism would surely be immersion.

6. The example referred to by Hammond is also irresistible. It is said of Eupolis, that being thrown into the sea he was baptized (*ebaptizeto*). This was immersion. This example shows also that the word may be applied when the object is destroyed as well as when it is raised again out of the water, though in general things dipped are raised up immediately after the dipping. Perhaps Mr. F. will catch at this, and say, ‘then baptizing means drowning.’ I answer—according to his theory it does; on the same principle that it means washing. But I regard this as false criticism. Drowning or washing, cooling or heating, cleansing or polluting, may be the *effect* of baptism or of *dipping*; but neither of these is in the word dip. The dipping is one thing—the drowning, or rising, or cooling, or defiling, or washing, is quite another thing. But, as Carson has somewhat humorously observed, if I can get Mr. F. under the water, perhaps he ‘will not make conscience of lying at the bottom.’

The expression from Heliod is equally decisive. ‘(*Baptizein eis ten limnen*) to baptize into the lake.’ And that of Æsop, ‘(*tes neos kinduneuses baptizesthai*) the ship being in danger of sinking.’ If a ship sinking is baptized, baptism must be immersion.

But the language of no man can have more authority on this subject than that of Josephus. A Jew who wrote in the Greek language in the Apostolic age, must be the best judge of the meaning of Greek words employed by the Jews in his own time. Now this author uses the word frequently, and always in the sense of immersion. Take the following examples. ‘Speaking of the ship in which

Jonah was, he says, ‘(*kai oson outo mellontos baptisthai ton skaphous*,) when the ship was on the point of sinking, or just about to be baptized.’ Again, ‘our ship being immersed or sinking (*baptisthentos*) in the midst of the Adriatic.’ Again, ‘the boy was sent to Jericho, and there being immersed in a pond (*baptizomenos en kolumbethoa*) he perished.’—See *Prof. Stuart*, page 300. Also, ‘the wave being raised very high overwhelmed or immerged them (*ebaptise*).

Josephus, lib. 4, chap. 4, sect. 6, page 146, says, when any persons were defiled by a dead body, they put a little of these ashes into spring water with hyssop, and (*baptisantes*) baptizing, i. e. dipping or immersing part of these ashes into it (*ekainon*), they sprinkled them with it.’ As Ryland observes, ‘his quotation clearly shows the difference between baptizing or dipping, and rantizing or sprinkling.’

Æsop’s fables—the ape and the dolphin. ‘The dolphin, vexed at such falsehood, (*baptizon auton apekteinen*) immersing him, killed him.’ The meaning here is plain.

Orpheus, in his Argonautics, page 78, says, ‘the sun (*baptizeto*) immerses or dips himself in the ocean.’

Anacreon, page 92. ‘Platting a garland once, I found Cupid among the roses; taking him by the wings (*ebaptis’ eis ton oinon*) I immersed him or plunged him into wine, and drank him with it,’ &c.

Basil, the Christian Father, speaks of ‘suffering with those that were (*baptizomenois*) immersed or plunged in the sea.’

Gregory Nazianzen says, ‘that we may not be (*baptisthomen*) immersed or sunk with the ship and crew.’

I might proceed and refer to a vast number of examples more to the same effect, but the reader will not desire it. Those already adduced, with the united and concurrent testimony of Prof. Stuart, Rev. A. Carson, and Dr. Ryland, that baptizo in the classics means to dip, plunge, or immerge, or sink, must, as it appears to me, be satisfactory to all, and place this matter on an ‘immoveable basis.’ And now I ask, what more is necessary to

close this whole debate fairly, than the well established fact, that for more than two thousand years, myriads of learned Greeks—the Greek church and Greek classical writers, have used baptizo invariably to signify immersion? Is not this the best, the most unexceptionable, the highest, the *ultimate* authority? Was there ever a word in any language whose specific meaning was better understood, and more effectually and sacredly guarded? Must not the mind which doubts on this subject be under the influence of denominational prejudice, or trammelled by preconceived opinion? And how utterly vain are quibbling and sophistry, when employed to prove that this word may have fifty meanings, and ‘the last as good as the first.’ But, says one, ‘if the primary meaning of baptizo is to dip, and this meaning is so fairly and fully established, it is strange, indeed, that such men as Dr. Dwight, and Dr. Miller, and the Rev. Mr. Fowler, should make such statements as they have done in relation to the import of this word.’ It is *mysterious*, I acknowledge. And the only way in which, on principles of Christian charity, I can account for their assertions, is, that they were brought up under the Abrahamic covenant, and were carried away into captivity in early life—received these assertions as true, and circulated them as truths, without examining them, except it were to establish themselves in these *sacred hereditary errors*. For instance, Dr. Dwight affirms, ‘that the great body of learned critics and lexicographers declare, that the original meaning of baptizo and bapto is to *tinge, stain, dye, color*, and that when *immersion* is meant, it is only a secondary and occasional sense.’ Now this is certainly untrue. It is a direct contradiction of truth, though Dwight, or, as said Paul, ‘though an angel from heaven’ assert it. And why he should have made such an assertion, in the very face of lexicographers and critics, is strange. It must be that he had not given the subject a careful examination, but took it for granted. Others, thinking that he was good authority, have, in turn, without due examination, received and circulated it as ‘unanswerable truth.’ This must have been the course

pursued, because those who have consulted lexicographers and critics know that no man can now attempt to support this assertion, without holding up himself as a monument of sectarian ignorance and folly. I speak advisedly; I am ready before any tribunal on earth to support this statement. I challenge any man to produce an instance from any book that was ever written in the Greek language, in which baptizo plainly and necessarily means to color or to dye. Prof. Stuart has acknowledged, page 303, that he has found no instance in which baptizo is employed to express tinging or coloring. And it is a well known fact, that lexicographers unanimously give immersion as the first meaning of baptizo. Still, it is a pleasure to me to say, that Dr. Dwight is, on other subjects, an excellent writer. His 'Christian Theology' is a work of great value.

So Mr. F. represents Dr. Miller as saying that 'immersion is not even the *common* meaning of baptizo.' Now men of learning and candor among all denominations, who have examined this subject, know that this statement is perfectly indefensible. He is also represented as saying, that there 'is not the *smallest probability* that John the Baptist ever baptized an individual by immersion'!! I will only say, that every man who is endowed with common sense, and can read the New Testament, may judge for himself about the correctness of such an assertion. 'Then went out unto him Jerusalem and Judea and all the region round about Jordan, and were *baptized* of him *in Jordan*, confessing their sins.' 'Jesus was baptized of *John in Jordan*, and went up straightway out of the water,' &c.—See Matthew iii: 5, 16; Mark i: 9. Now throw Dr. Miller's assertion into the scale of Bible truth, and see if it is not 'found wanting': 'there is not the *smallest probability* that John ever baptized an individual by immersion.'

Some things equally strange have taken place in our latitude. The Rev. Mr. Fowler (it is generally supposed,) over the name of 'Concord', asserted, while calling public attention to the testimony of 'well authenticated eccle-

siastical historians', that Dupin and Eusebius and Zelenus and Calvin and Doddridge and many other ecclesiastical historians declare unequivocally that baptism was administered in the first centuries by sprinkling or pouring; and historians almost *without number* have shown that this mode of baptism,' (that is, pouring or sprinkling—no matter which,) 'has been practiced not only in the days of Christ and the Apostles, but in every age since'!! Now where is the passage to be found in any well authenticated history on earth, that justifies this statement? Besides, only two of these men which he has named ever wrote a history of the church!—Calvin's and Doddridge's histories. I have called for them in vain since they were mentioned by 'Concord.' I perceive that Doddridge, the 'well authenticated ecclesiastical historian' has lately been converted into a '*deeply read historical scholar*'! The testimony of Calvin, Doddridge, Dupin, &c. will be noticed in their place; and it will be seen that they tell a very different story from that which he has put into their lips. Suffice it to say, there is not, under the wide canopy of heaven, a candid man, who is well acquainted with this subject, that will attempt a vindication of the statement above. And yet the First Congregational Church in Fall River have taken up this controversy, and, after *cool deliberation*, have 'resolved unanimously' that they 'sanction and approve' this statement, and many other things of similar character, 'most heartily and fully, as a sound defence of their doctrines and forms of worship.' This is strange indeed; but so it is. The facts have all been published to the world, and cannot now be concealed. Now when any one can account for the *conduct* and the assertions of Mr. Fowler and his people, perhaps on the same principle I can account for the positive but unfounded assertions of Drs. Miller, Dwight and others. I mention these things to show, that it will not do in this day of ingenious devices and *specious errors*, to depend on the authority of great names. Great and good men do suffer their judgments to be swerved by party feeling and denominational prejudice. It will not do to place *unlimited confidence* in ministers. They are

but men. They have the passions and prejudices of men. We must study the word of God, and examine the ordinances of his church for ourselves. May kind Heaven roll on the blessed day when there shall be more intelligence and candor and love, and less of sectarian prejudice and recklessness among the avowed followers of the Lamb.

CHAPTER III.

TESTIMONY OF LEXICOGRAPHERS.

ON this topic I need not enlarge, as I have already obtained from classic usage proof which sustains me in my position. This is the source from which lexicographers derive all their authority. I have said, and I trust shown, that lexicographers have sometimes taken undue liberty in affixing secondary meanings to words. I have endeavored to point out the false criticism by which they have been deceived—that because words can be used interchangeably, their meaning is the same. Baptism and washing may be used interchangeably in some cases, because in some cases he that is baptized is washed, as the effect of baptism. But no good philologist will say that baptism means to wash. To illustrate, take our modal word *dip*. A man may enquire of one who has been down to bathe in our harbor, ‘did you dip yourself, or did you bathe, or did you wash yourself?’ In this case these words may be used indifferently. But will any good English scholar contend that bathe or wash is the definition of *dip*? O yes, say our popular critics, because they can be used interchangeably. This criticism is false, however specious it may appear. On the same principle we may say that a horse is a *reindeer* and a *dog*; for they may be used interchangeably. The Laplander uses the one and the Kamskatdale the other in the place of a horse. Again, a *man* and a horse may be used interchangeably, in some instances. When the ‘nation’s guest,’ the immortal Lafayette, visited our shores, in several instances men took the place of horses, and drew his carriage. But will those who advocate the *fifty meanings scheme* insist, in view of that fact, that a *man* means not only an intellectual and moral being, but a *horse* also? I ask, have we not adopted a false criticism in defining baptizo? Has not the speciousness of this false philology deceived critics, commentators, and even lexicographers?

It may seem strange that one who has never made any pretensions to critical and classic learning, should venture to express his opinion with so much freedom on this subject. I am well aware that the unkind insinuation has been thrown out that I have no just claim to notice as a man of science, for my brow has never been plumed with academic honors. To this I will only say, in the way of inquiry, has this subject any *special* connexion with an academy or a college? Must I be despised merely because in early life, while my soul panted to enjoy the privileges which others enjoyed in the schools of science, and longed to drink at the fountains of knowledge, I was unknown to the world, struggling under embarrassment, and compelled by a sense of duty to labor with my hands for the support of *poor* but pious parents? Because no friendly hand was extended to help me, and no voice to cheer me? Because that sometimes, after the toils of the day were ended, and while evening throw around me her sable curtain, and others were enjoying the sweet luxury of repose, I was pouring over some book, or plodding through some science, unassisted and alone?

But this I leave. If my writings exhibit correct principles and interesting truth, perhaps the candid will not condemn the writer because he was not rocked in the cradle of affluence, nor fostered by the 'Alma Mater.' And if the truly learned shall discover in the productions of his hasty pen, any want of classic polish, still they will make every reasonable allowance for one who would have embraced 'most gladly' the same means of intellectual discipline which they have so richly enjoyed. Besides, we cannot always estimate correctly the amount of *knowledge* which a man possesses, by the time spent at the University; nor measure with much exactitude his scientific attainments by the parchment on which are written his name and degree.

Without pretensions to great learning or wisdom, I must be allowed to think for myself, and in a proper manner to express my thoughts. I shall not bow to the mere authority of great names, nor to *positive* but *unproved* assertions. It appears to me that lexicographers and oth-

ers have been led unconsciously into the evil which I have mentioned; and that this error has been the cause of much distressing and unnecessary dispute. But so far as the argument on baptism is concerned, my cause is perfectly safe in the hands of lexicographers. It will, I suppose, be admitted, (for it is true, whether admitted or not,) that ‘*all* lexicographers and critics of any note,’ are perfectly agreed in this, that the *primary, obvious, prevailing* signification of baptizo is ‘to dip, plunge or immerge into anything liquid.’

It will also be admitted that the *primary* and prevailing definition should always be taken as the true one, unless something in the nature of the subject, or the structure of the sentence, demands a different meaning. To use the *nervous style* of Mr. F., “every young tyro in our high schools” understands this law of interpretation.

And as there is nothing in the nature of Christian baptism—nothing in the construction of the passages in the Bible in which baptizo is found—which requires any other than the ordinary meaning, lexicographers do effectually and triumphantly sustain me in my position. To avoid this conclusion, we must destroy the premises. I verily believe they are invulnerable. If Mr. F. tries their solidity, I think they will be found firmer than his ‘solid rock.’ Will he deny that lexicographers agree in giving *immersion* as the primary meaning of baptizo? If he does, he will injure his cause more than mine, by such a denial; for he will deny that which is *evidently* true. Will he reject the canon, ‘that the primary meaning of a word shall be taken, unless something in the nature of the subject, or the structure of the sentence, demands another or secondary meaning. If he does, he wages an unnatural war with usage, rejects the canon adopted by all candid reasoners, and sets at defiance the laws of correct and critical interpretation.

Will he say there is anything in the nature of Christian baptism which *demand*s anything else but immersion? If so, the common sense of mankind, the practice of the primitive church and of the Greek church, and the testi-

mony of ecclesiastical historians, are all against him. Yes, and what is more, he is against himself—for he admits that immersion is baptism, which would not be true, if baptism is *necessarily* anything else but immersion. We are led therefore by lexicographers to the ‘irresistible conclusion,’ that baptism is immersion, and nothing else.—Reader, is not this fair and reasonable? Perhaps Mr. F. will say it “has the *semblance* of argument.” It may be he will call it “personal abuse and ridicule and vulgarity.” But possibly you will like to know what lexicographers give immersion as the primary meaning of baptizo. I will tell you. 1, Donnegan. 2, Schrevelius. 3, Scapula. 4, Pasor. 5, Buddæus. 6, Hadrian. 7, Suidas. 8, Coulon. 9, Stephanus. 10, Cole. 11, Schleusner. 12, Hedericus. 13, Pickering. 14, Parkhurst. 15, Plantinus. 16, Stockius. 17, Grove. 18, Xylander. 19, Hopper. 20, Hartung. 21, Gesner. 22, Junius. 23, Constantine. 24, Tusanus. All these, (and they are all whose definitions I have ever examined) give immersion as the primary meaning of baptizo. Some of them give no other meaning. They generally give, to *immerse*, to *dip*, to *wash*. The principle on which they give *washing* as one meaning, has been explained. I think it is incorrect. Some of them give a number of meanings. To this they would be prompted by the customs which have prevailed to some extent in the church. Many of these lexicons have been written since pouring and sprinkling have been in use. It is very easy to account for the fact that in passing this word through two languages, and multiplying definitions to twenty or thirty, some in Latin and some in English, they have put in a word which seems to favor sprinkling or pouring. I have exhibited this whole process on the 19th page of my address, to which I would refer the reader. In one instance only, (if I do not mistake or misremember) do they mention pouring. Schleusner, according to Mr. F., gives as his fourth definition, *profundo largiter*. This is not the meaning of baptizo, any more than is ‘popping,’ which is given by Mr. Ewing, a Pædobaptist in Europe. But take it as it

is for a moment. If Mr. F. takes this meaning, I would ask, as the definition is not to *pour*, but to *pour out largely*, what is it to be poured out? Is it the candidate? How reads his commission: Baptism is *pouring out largely*. 'Go ye, teach all nations, pouring them out largely,' &c. The candidate is to be poured out—yea, he must be *poured out largely*. How will he perform this work?

I should much rather baptize fifty suitable candidates, than attempt 'to pour out one *candidate largely*.' It is torturing language to talk about *pouring out* a man. Is it the *water* which is to be poured out largely? Then his commission is to '*go pour out water largely*,' and every time he pours out water largely, he baptizes, whether he has any candidate or not; for in this case the pouring respects the water and not the subject. But perhaps the definition must be altered and enlarged, and garbled and interpolated, so as to stand thus 'go—pour out water largely on the candidate.' Then as this precious meaning is all of the kind which he can obtain from twenty-four lexicons, and several Latin dictionaries, why does he not follow its direction, and '*pour out largely*' in baptism! This *sophistical trifling* on the meaning of a word as plain as baptizo, is reprehensible in any author who claims to be a manly and serious and critical reasoner. Let us see for one moment where the fifty 'meaning' plan will lead, if followed out. One of these meanings which goes before sprinkling is '*to blot out*.' Our authors business then will be to take his candidate and *blot him out*. Again according to some lexicons and Latin dictionaries it is '*to remove*.' In this case the subject must be *removed*. And here a *host* of new definitions would arise, but according to the plan all equally good. He may remove the candidate—in or out, up or down, backwards or forwards, rapidly or slowly, softly or severely, &c. &c. &c. O that God would show men the folly and guilt of trifling with his plain commands, by adopting theories, which if carried out into action would enshroud the church in darkness tangible like that which once brooded over Egypt. This may be pronounced '*ridicule*,' but it is in fact only ex-

tending the very principle which Mr F. labors so assiduously to maintain. I have indulged in these remarks simply to show the absurdity of this plan. This is certainly no pleasant task to me, but I do feel before God that it is my duty to take the dissecting knife to this baptismal system, and every incision shows plainly that it has 'no muscles.'

No Greek lexicographer has given sprinkling as the meaning of baptizo. They do give *lavo*, and in the fourth or fifth definition of *lavo* in the Latin English dictionaries, we have sprinkle. But *lavo* never means to sprinkle, except in that figure of speech called by Rhetoricians *hyperbole*. With as much propriety may we say that washing, is sprinkling. 'She washed his feet with tears!' will Mr. F. give sprinkle as the meaning of wash? I trow not. I feel it my duty to remark that he has not done justice to this word in his lectures. He renders the common Latin meanings thus:—*mergo*, *abluo*, *lavo*—to immerse—to wash—to *sprinkle*. It is not fair in giving the definition of a word to pass the first three and give the fourth, which is not the meaning in one instance out of ten thousand; but this he has done. He renders '*lavo*' to *sprinkle*: It ought to be—*lavo* to *wash* or *bathe* or *lave*—It corresponds with *lave* as *mergo* does with *immersion* precisely; the meaning of immerse is to dip—of *lave*, to wash or bathe. Another thing I am sorry to see. He ranks Ainsworth, Buck, Brown and Leigh among lexicographers—in a way that is calculated to impose on the unwary reader. But I will pursue these ghostly meanings no longer. I wish the reader to understand distinctly, that *all* lexicographers who deserve the name, agree in giving immersion as the *first* meaning of baptizo. This fact is a strong presumptive evidence of what is undoubtedly true, that the other meanings were appended by way of compliment to Pædobaptist practice. Indeed lexicographers are bound to define words according to usage and the practice of the times. A man who writes a dictionary in *this day*, must give sprinkle as one of its meanings, because with a portion of the Christian

community, and by their usage, it does mean to sprinkle. But originally, and for thirteen hundred years, and with the Greeks for two thousand years, it has not had the meaning of pour or sprinkle, any more than it has to *heat*, or to *cool*, or to *stab*, or to '*pop*.'—With the universal argument of lexicographers that immersion is the primary meaning of baptizo—and the canon laid down at the commencement of my remarks under the head of lexicographical testimony, that the primary meaning is the true one, unless something in the nature of the subject demands a secondary meaning; with this fact and this rule before the reader, I leave this topic. We are led fairly to the conclusion that baptism is immersion and nothing else.

CHAPTER IV.

TESTIMONY OF CRITICS.

MR. F. calls the attention of his readers, p. 20th, to the opinions of '*learned Greek critics.*' Under this head, he has referred to about forty men. I have neither time nor inclination to examine their opinions separately. I present a few general remarks.

1st. This kind of evidence is abundant and quite imposing, but as unsubstantial as it is *specious*. The author has introduced a *curious* collection of '*learned Greek critics.*' Most of them appear about as well when classed under this head, as do John Calvin, Doddridge, and Zelenus, among well authenticated ecclesiastical historians—or Buck, Ainsworth, Leigh, and Bible Dictionary, among '*Greek lexicographers.*' Among the number however are the names of *some few* great and good men, whom it may be well to consult in the character of critics. But these, as we shall see directly, testify against him.

2nd. Not one of all these witnesses has proved, by an appeal to the proper authorities, that baptizo means any thing else but immersion. They merely give their opinions, without showing the ground on which those opinions are based. A thousand such witnesses *prove nothing*.

3d. I can easily present four times the number of witnesses, principally Pædobaptists, who are better entitled to the name of learned Greek critics, to contradict this testimony, and who have given their *opinion* that baptizo means to immerse, and not to sprinkle. But these conflicting opinions, exhibited in contrast with each other, can never decide this controversy. Ten thousand of these witnesses, on either side, are good for nothing. We must appeal to higher and more impartial authority than selfish and prejudiced *sectarians*, whether they be called critics, divines, or even lexicographers. We must resort to classic usage and the New Testament; from these there is no appeal. Much time and labor have been lost by writers

on both sides, by setting in hostile array, against each other, the mere opinions and positive assertions of *denominational* critics. This is the strong hold of Pædobaptism:—the baseless *opinions* of great men. The plan is, to hold up these opinions, paint them in glowing colors, pronounce them the sentiments of *very learned*, candid, pious men—whose writings are ‘exceedingly interesting,’ and strongly insinuate that it would be sacrilegious to call in question such *authority*! And, if a man, by fair and convincing argumentation, shows that *some* of the opinions of these men are unfounded, and their reasoning illogical, their premises false, and their conclusions unjust;—he is sure to incur the ‘*pious wrath*’ of all those who have been brought up under the Abrahamic covenant, and who were taught, before they left the nursery, to reverence the *parson*. Such an impertinent meddler will be denounced as being guilty of ‘personal abuse and ridicule and vulgarity,’ because he ventures to examine and refute these *sacred* and *hoary-headed opinions*. It is too much trouble for most men to examine religious subjects and think for themselves. Hence thousands, in this enlightened land, surrounded by facilities for the acquisition of religious knowledge, with all necessary means in hand, to ascertain the nature and design of Christian ordinances, depend entirely upon the reckless and unproved assertions of *great and good men*. ‘Our *ministers* certainly understand this matter, they will not deceive us,’ is the ‘*bona fide*’ argument which supports Pædobaptism in Massachusetts at this moment. On what other principle, I ask, has the 1st Congregational Church in Fall River been led recently to ‘sanction and approve’ some of the most unwarrantable assertions and egregious mistakes?

4th. Mr. F.’s critics contradict each other. One says, ‘baptizo signifies *nothing* but washing.’ Woe unto Mr. F. if this be true. He never washed a candidate by sprinkling in his life. Another says, ‘it signifies dipping and sprinkling.’ Another, ‘it means not only to immerse, but also to *pour*.’ Another, ‘it signifies any kind of ablution or cleansing.’ Another, ‘they have been baptized, who have been *tinged* or wetted with water.’ How can a man

be *tinged* with water? Another, ‘pouring or *rubbing* water on,’ &c. Now, these are mere *assertions*, and it really appears to me they are *foolish, contradictory* assertions. They certainly have no basis on correct philology.

5th. His most respectable witnesses, and those who are best known in the religious world, testify against him.—Such are Calvin, Beza, Doddridge, Luther, Melancthon, Witsius, Stuart, &c. Now, observe the question at issue, is—not what will do as a *substitute* for baptism—not whether we may alter the original laws of this institution—not what others have practiced—not what circumstantial evidence there may be in favor of sprinkling—not what baptism *may* mean—but this is the question now before us:—WHAT DOES BAPTIZO MEAN? I know Mr. F. complains in his preliminary remarks, that the Baptists ‘misrepresent Pædobaptist authors.’ I will just reply, that we do sometimes refer to Pædobaptist authors; but we do not intend to misrepresent them.

2d. We refer to them because, if we introduce the testimony of a Baptist, however learned and candid he may be, his testimony is rejected. Look at his 21st page, and see with what dexterity he turns the Rev. E. Foster out of court, because forsooth, ‘he is one of *their own number*’! Now, suppose we adopt this sweeping principle with his witnesses. We might clear his whole board at a single stroke! except a little host of *stale* Roman Catholic *African* bishops, and they are of his number on this subject; and, in fact, they are the very beings to whom he is indebted for his views on the subject of baptism. For he has not proved, and cannot prove the existence of infant sprinkling, nor sprinkling for baptism, until he finds them among *African bishops* at least two hundred years after Christ. If he has any direct and positive evidence, it will be easy to present it. He has attempted this task, but it is, as I shall show hereafter, an entire failure.

3d. We sometimes appeal to Pædobaptist authors, because their testimony is peculiarly valuable. Indeed, we may say of it as David said of Goliath’s sword, ‘there is none like it.’ When a man is compelled by candor and the love of truth, to bear witness against himself, such witness in any court is considered conclusive.

4. I call your attention to the testimony of Calvin, Luther, &c., *now*, because Mr. F. has summoned them into court, and it is no more than fair that I should *cross-examine* them, and let them speak, if they will, in favor of my cause.

5. I do this because Mr. F. has said, page 13, rather unkindly I think, that they assert 'that these authors testify in their favor and support their views; and probably they sometimes create the belief in uninformed minds that their *assertions* are true.' Now I am bound to acknowledge as he very plainly insinuates, that the Baptists are guilty of circulating falsehood and of deceiving honest people, or else show that some Pædobaptists do in fact testify in our favor. This I shall show. And in doing this I must necessarily show that he has misrepresented them himself. Mr. F. has introduced these men before us to prove that '*baptizo* means *affusion*.' Now I shall attempt to prove, from the testimony of his own witnesses, that *baptizo* means to *immerse*.

1. John Calvin.—'It is of no consequence at all whether the person baptized be totally immersed, or whether he is only sprinkled, by an affusion of water.' Here is the witness of Mr. F. This is the *opinion* of Calvin. But we are in search of the meaning of *baptizo*. Let him speak to the point. He adds in the same sentence, "Although the word *baptize* signifies *to dip*, and it is certain that *dipping* was the practice of the ancient church:—See Calvin's Institute, vol. 4, chap. 15, sect. 19. Thus you see that Mr. F. has misrepresented Calvin; for he brings him forward to prove that *baptizo* means to affuse, whereas his decided opinion is very plainly expressed that 'it signifies to dip or immerse.' But you say here is a contradiction in Calvin. Baptism signifies to dip, and dipping was the practice of the ancient church, and yet it is of no consequence how a man is baptized. The truth is, Calvin had not shaken off all the Roman Catholic notions, for he says, "The church did grant herself liberty *since* the beginning to change the rites somewhat except the substance." I believe that this plan of 'changing rites somewhat' is very wrong—still it was upon this principle

that Calvin based the opinion that an affusion of water would do for baptism. He thought that baptism might be changed from immersion to sprinkling, and yet the substance of the ordinance be retained. But I have yet to learn how sprinkling can be the substance of *immersion*. But with regard to the meaning of baptizo, Calvin says, 'it means to dip.' He sustains my position.

2. Martin Luther says, on the text Romans vi: 4—'On this account I could wish that such as are to be baptized should be completely immersed into water, according to the *meaning* of the word and the signification of the ordinance; not because I think it necessary, but because it would be beautiful to have so full and perfect a sign of so full and perfect a thing, as also, without doubt, it was instituted by Christ.' Here, again, we have the *opinion* of another of Mr. Fowler's witnesses, that *immersion* is not necessary, but immersion is a beautiful sign of a full and perfect thing—*immersion* is the meaning of *baptism*—and immersion was instituted by Christ, without doubt. I certainly cannot understand such logic. But I hope Mr. F. will not browbeat the Baptists, because Pædobaptists contradict themselves. Again, Luther says, 'the term baptism is a Greek word, and may be rendered *immersion*, as when we plunge something in water that it may be entirely covered with water. * * In baptism they ought to be completely immersed and immediately drawn out, for the etymology of the word requires this.' Again, it is a fact that should be generally known, that Luther translated the New Testament into German. He has rendered baptizo *taufen*, which signifies, as he himself defines it, to *immerse* or *plunge* into water. Thus Matt. iii: 1. '*Zuder zuit kam Johannes der tauffer.*—In those days came John the dipper or immerser.'

Now is it not singular that Mr. F. should appeal to Calvin and Luther to prove that Baptizo means pouring or sprinkling? And who is it that imposes on the 'ignorant and uninformed' by laboring to make them believe that which is not true? Beza, he says, declares that 'baptism is rightly administered by sprinkling.' Be this as it may, he has acknowledged in a note, page 25, that Beza gives

immersion as the meaning of baptizo. And this is the point at issue. Beza says, 'Christ commanded us to be baptized, by which word it is certain that immersion is signified. Nor does *baptizein* signify to wash, except by consequence; for it properly signifies immersion for the sake of dying. To be baptized in water signifies no other than to be immersed in water, which is the external ceremony of baptism.' Thus Beza 'favors my views,' and bears his testimony against Mr. F. on the *meaning of baptizo*.

Mr. F. refers to Witsius, but does not tell what he says. I do not much wonder, for this is his testimony. '*It cannot be denied that the native signification of the word baptizo is to plunge or dip.*' Melancthon says it means 'to dip.' Stuart's testimony has already been exhibited. I might go on and fill up fifty pages with the candid concessions of Pædobaptist authors and critics, but I forbear. I have examined the above merely because Mr. F. brought them forward to prove his doctrine that baptizo means pouring and sprinkling, and because he accused me with others of misrepresenting them. The reader will judge for himself who it is that 'misrepresents these authors, and deceives ignorant and uninformed minds.' I am sorry that Mr. F. will not admit what is so evidently true, and what his most intelligent and candid brethren on both sides of the Atlantic do admit, viz. that baptizo means to immerse—that immersion was the practice of the primitive church. They say that 'mode is not essential'; that 'baptism is an external rite'; that it is 'symbol and dedication'; and they are led to practice sprinkling by these considerations, and not by the meaning of the word—not by the practice of John or that of the Apostles. If he would take a stand along with this class of Pædobaptists, (which is by far the greatest,) then there would be no deception in this case, but every man would judge for himself whether it be safe to alter or amend the positive institutions of the Gospel. I shall give no quarter to that doctrine, nor to the logic by which it is supported. If all the world were to embrace it, I would stand a lonely, conscientious dissenter—(at least I ought to do so.) I

have learned beyond all dispute that baptizo means to immerse. Christ says, 'be baptized', and '*God forbid*' that I should substitute something else for *baptism*. Let those who dare to do it, and teach men so, remember what Jesus hath said, 'they shall be least in the kingdom of heaven.'

It appears evident from a glance at the learned Greek critics which Mr. F. has summoned to his help, that he lost sight of his object, or did not understand his subject, or that he was ignorant of the character of his witnesses, or else intended to impose on his readers by introducing 'a cloud of witnesses' which after all *prove* nothing in favor of his cause; while his most respectable authorities are directly against him. I might in turn call out an army of *Baptists*, and dignify them with the appellation of '*learned Greek critics*,' and show their unanimous opinion that baptizo means to *dip* or *immerse*, and nothing else. But I have no more reverence for Baptist than I have for Pædobaptist opinion. Neither is valuable in this case, unless founded on correct philological principle, and sustained by classic usage. To these we must come, and before these we must bow, or there is no end to this unpleasant controversy.

I will, however, just add the following testimonies, as they are from eminent Pædobaptist authors, and Barclay a Friend, who could not have been swayed by partiality for Baptist usages.

1. *Budæus*.—'The words baptizein and baptismos are not to be interpreted of *aspersion*, but always of immersion.'

2. *Alstidius*.—'Baptizein, to baptize, signifies *only* to immerse, not to wash, except by consequence.'

3. *J. J. Wetstenius*.—'To baptize is to plunge—to dip. The body or part of the body *under the water* is said to be baptized.'

4. *J. Altingius*.—'For baptism is immersion, when the whole body is immersed; but the term baptism is never used concerning aspersion, &c.'

5. *Casaubon*.—'This was the rite of baptizing, that persons were plunged into the water; which the very word *baptizein*, to baptize, sufficiently declares.'

6. *Cattenburgh*.—‘In baptism the whole body is ordered to be immersed.’

7. *Keckermannus*.—‘We cannot deny, that the first institution of baptism consisted in immersion and not sprinkling.’

8. *Vitringa*.—‘The act of baptizing is the immersion of *believers* in water. This expresses the force of the word. Thus also it was performed by Christ and his Apostles.’

9. *Venema*.—‘The word to baptize is no where used in the scriptures for sprinkling.’

10. *Bossuet*.—‘To baptize signifies to plunge, as granted by all the world.’

11. *Witsius*.—‘It cannot be denied that the native signification of the word baptize is to plunge or to dip.’

12. *Robert Barclay*.—‘The Greek word baptizo signifies *immergo*, that is to plunge and dip in—and that was the proper use of water baptism among the Jews, and also by John and the primitive Christians who used it.
* * So that if our adversaries will stick to the word, they must alter their mode of *sprinkling*.’

But, reader, I will not tire your patience by citations from Pædobaptist authors. It really seems to me that there is no need of dispute on this subject; there is not a word in any language which more plainly and invariably signifies immersion than the Greek *baptizo*. At least this is my candid opinion. I will only remark that all critics are agreed with lexicographers that immersion is the plain, primary, prevailing signification of baptizo. By the common law of correct interpretation—that the first meaning of a word, unless something in the subject demands a *secondary* meaning, should be taken—and as there is nothing in Gospel baptism which demands a secondary, (much less a ‘fiftieth’) meaning—guided by critics, we arrive at the conclusion again, that baptism is immersion. It is nothing else.

CHAPTER V.

HISTORIC EVIDENCE.

Mr. F. page 54, attempts to prove from ecclesiastical historians that the Christian church ever since the days of the Apostles has practiced affusion for baptism. I am constrained to say, and I say it in sorrow, that the very *attempt* betrays a total want of candor, or entire ignorance of the subject. I really thought it was too late in the day for any understanding Pædobaptist to engage in such a desperate effort. But as it has been made, and is now sanctioned by four clergymen in this vicinity, we will just examine the historians which Mr. F. has introduced to our notice.

Concerning them, I remark, 1st. Out of thirty-five historians, about five only ever wrote a history! 2d. Only about four or five of the whole number say any thing at all concerning the common practice of the church, and they are not historians. 3d. All the historians among them, who ever wrote a history, declare that immersion was the practice of the primitive church! Some may be startled at these statements—but let any man who is able and willing, disprove them. If they are not correct, it is easy to show their inaccuracy. I have not made these remarks rashly, but with facts before me to sustain them. True, I cannot go all over this subject, nor is it necessary. I will examine a few of the first cases, which are certainly in favor of Mr. F., if any in the whole group. These must serve as a specimen of the rest.

1. ‘Dr. Cave says the primitive Christians thought the martyrs sufficiently qualified for heaven by being baptized in their own blood.’ It is well known that Cave and others have mentioned the sufferings and cruel death of martyrs under the figurative idea of baptism in blood. But I beg to know what this has to do with the practice of the *church* respecting water baptism? Surely this is foreign to the subject on hand. Mr. F. will not say that martyrs

were sprinkled *in their own blood* ! For the language is incorrect and the thought degrading. A man may be sprinkled *with* his own blood every time he happens to bleed at the nose—but this would not, in the opinion of ancient nor modern divines, qualify the man for heaven. Dr. Cave did not believe that sprinkling was baptism, nor that *affusion* was practiced by the ancient church. Here is his testimony on the subject. ‘The action having proceeded thus far, the party to be baptized was wholly immersed or put under water, which was the *universal custom* of those times.’—See ‘Primitive Christianity,’ part I, chap. 10, page 203, ed. 7. If Mr. F. had quoted a sentence from his almanac in this place, it had been better for his cause.

2d. Mr. F. declares that Walker says that a ‘*certain* distinguished bishop decided in a *certain* case that the man was baptized if he only had water poured upon him.’—Does this throw any light on the practice of the Christian church with respect to baptism? 2d. Here are several *certain* things, and yet nothing is more *uncertain*. Here is a ‘*certain*’ *uncertain* bishop, and a ‘*certain*’ *uncertain* case, and a ‘*certain*’ *uncertain* man in that case, and a certain Fall River lecturer holding up that man, case and bishop to prove that the primitive church practised affusion!! Why not tell who this bishop was, where he lived, and who was the man, and what was the case? Does the cause of God and truth demand such props as this? Does not this case by *implication* destroy the position it was intended to support? ‘In a *certain case* pouring would do!’ This implies what is evidently true, that the practice of the church was to immerse; but in cases of sickness and imminent danger where immersion could not be practised, a ‘*certain*’ ignorant but merciful bishop decided that a sick man had better be *affused* than to go to hell, for the want of baptism. ‘A dying man will catch at straws.’

Next comes Iræneus, but as he is no *historian*, and as he says nothing about the practice of the church, he may step aside. This witness is not in point; and I challenge the proof that Iræneus ever wrote such a sentence as the one here put into his mouth.

Next comes Athanasius. But as his testimony is indefinite, and amounts to nothing, and as he lived and wrote about the middle of the fourth century, I shall not accept his testimony, to prove the practice of the church for the first two centuries. And finally, the passage itself is, I believe, spurious. It is a well known fact that writings have been ascribed to Athanasius, which were written by Vigilus, an African bishop of the fifth century, though others ascribe the Athanasian creed to Hilarius. There must have been a great 'paucity' of *substantial* historic evidence in this case, or such witnesses would not have been brought forward. Next it is said that Laurence, who suffered martyrdom, before he died '*baptized with a pitcher of water* one of his executioners.' Can any one doubt, after such explicit proof, that affusion was the practice of the church? Suppose I was laboring to show the common practice of the Dutch Reformed church in America, and should refer to an event which occurred in the Vermont State Prison; should I be in order? Should I prove myself a just and manly reasoner? It is worthy of remark that Mr. F. has introduced this very singular case of baptism to prove the *practice* of the church; while Prof. Stuart has the candor to say, in relation to the same affair, p. 359, "The Acti Laurentii apud Surium, Tom. 4, mentions a Roman soldier who was baptized by Laurence with a pitcher of water; and the same person also baptized Lucillus, by pouring water upon his head. But all such cases were *manifestly* regarded as exceptions to the *common* usage of the church."

Next comes the case of Novation, who in time of severe *illness* was 'affused,' as a substitute for baptism. This I believe is the first instance on historic record. This is readily admitted: it occurred about the middle of the third century. It is, however, very evident, as will be shown hereafter, that nothing like this was practiced in the church, or allowed to individuals only in case of dangerous illness. It is also certain from history, that this baptism was considered so imperfect, that when Novatian, (as he recovered from his sickness,) was chosen bishop, many objected to his election, because 'a man who had been baptized by

sprinkling on a sick bed, was not fit for a bishop." And the church was rent with division on the subject. Sprinkling from first to last has been a vexatious and troublesome thing. Cyprian, who was the first bishop that plead for the practice of sprinkling the sick, gave this direction in such cases,—“If they happen to recover, let them be had to the river, and there be dipped.” If Mr. F. believed with these deluded men, that sprinkling would save the soul, I should not wonder that like them, he should, in cases of mortal sickness, sprinkle men or babes, to save them from eternal ruin. But as he does not believe this doctrine, I confess it is strange to me that he should refer to clinic baptism to justify sprinkling, under very different circumstances, and for very different reasons.

Eusebius says, Eccl. Hist. lib. 6, chap. 43, page 113, “He, (Novatus or Novatian) fell into a grievous distemper, and it being supposed that he would die immediately, he received baptism, (being besprinkled with water on the bed whereon he lay: if that can be called baptism.) Mr. F.’s quotation, p. 55, reads thus: “Says Eusebius, the ecclesiastical historian, who lived not long after, Novatian being visited with sickness, baptism was administered to him *according to the custom of those times*, by affusion or sprinkling. Eusebius’ Eccl. Hist. Liber. 6, cap. 5 and 43, which now lies before me.” As Mr. F. informs us that the history of Eusebius ‘now lies before him,’ will he take it up and read it, and in his next edition favor the public with a correct quotation of the passage, and not make out a *sentence*, one half of which is taken from cap. 5, and the other from cap. 43? It is well enough for the book to *lie before* him, but it should not be made to *lie to* the public. Next comes this witness: “Eusebius mentions Basilides also as ‘having been baptized in prison.’” Very well; what of that? The Rev. William Collier, a Baptist minister of Massachusetts, about ten years ago baptized twenty prisoners in our State Penitentiary, without going beyond the precincts of the prison; but he did not sprinkle one of them. Do either of these facts prove that the church in the age immediately succeeding the apostles, practiced affusion? This testimony surely is valueless to Mr. Fowler.

Next appears Cyprian. This witness says nothing to the case in hand, but merely gives his *opinion*—not about the practice of the church, but about the meaning of a passage in Ezekiel, and also his opinion that sprinkling was of equal validity of the salutary bath.' Ten thousand such witnesses would not prove the point in discussion. But I do not believe that this quotation or the next is correct. Dupin is represented as stating that Constantine 'was clothed in a long white robe, laid upon his bed, and baptized in a solemn manner by Eusebius.' For authority Mr. F. appeals to Pond. Now I do not believe that these quotations, (and in fact several others from the same source,) are correct, for the following reasons: 1st. I have but little confidence in Mr. Pond, as a sectarian disputant. He is very apt to make *mistakes*, when he deals with the Baptists. This is the celebrated author which Mr. 'Concord' brought up before this community, and to whose writings he referred for facts that would throw our beloved Burman missionary, Judson, whose name ought to be dear to every American Christian, into the shade. This is the man who labored to 'affuse' Mr. Judson with slander; in doing which, he exhibited so much sectarian spleen, that one of his own brethren, Rev. Mr. Nott, who was well acquainted with Mr. Judson, administered to him a most righteous, timely, and pointed rebuke. The reader can judge in some measure about the merits of the case, by the concluding paragraph of the Rev. Mr. Nott, a respectable Congregational minister, now living in this State. He says on p. 12, addressing Mr. Pond, "I am not intimate with cases of political slander, but I confess I should scarcely expect to find in the violence and unfairness of party feeling, a grosser instance of unjust and uncharitable construction." He concludes by saying, "Allow me, Sir, in closing this letter, to press upon your consideration Mr. Judson's claims to a more *kind* and candid treatment than he has received at your hands. Many years has he been separated from his friends and countrymen, an exile for the sake of the gospel, among a barbarous people. He has experienced abundantly, the anxieties and trials, the deprivations and sufferings, of a

missionary of Christ. He has labored faithfully and steadfastly for his Master, and has meekly borne reproach for doing what he considered his duty. He has shown himself worthy of our respect and admiration, and we should do all that we can to encourage and strengthen him; we should not be hasty to reproach him. Why renounce with the faithful missionary that candor of construction which you would not fail to exercise in the case of your meanest neighbor? Why convert the whispers of suspicion into clamorous facts, and aim a deadly blow at his character? Excuse these observations. I have too often held sweet counsel with my absent friend not to feel deeply interested in a cause which touches the apple of his eye.

SAMUEL NOTT, jun."

Thus it appears evident that Mr. Pond made a little mistake in the affair of Mr. Judson. He is the author to which Mr. F. is indebted 'for many valuable quotations;' see note, p. 20. But I have pretty good evidence that in his treatise on baptism, from which Mr. F. quotes unsparingly, he has made some mistakes. 1st. According to our author, p. 58, he has deciphered the origin of the Baptists in the sixteenth century! This is a small mistake. Instead of presenting him with a 'prize medal' for his profound researches and candid historic records, (for Mr. F. ranks him among historians,) I would inform him that he may find in the four Evangelists and the Acts of the Apostles, and in the authentic history of the first two centuries, a more impartial account of the origin and progress, doctrine and discipline of the Baptists, than he has found in the sixteenth century.

He or Mr. F. has made a sad mistake in quoting the sybiline verse, p. 26. I know not which is in fault in this case; they are kindred spirits, and both are sometimes found, like other men, in error.

With respect to Dupin's testimony about the baptism of Constantine, p. 55, I *believe* there is a mistake. Mr. Pond refers to Dupin's Ecclesiastical History, vol. 2, p. 84. Now I know that in the London edition of Dupin's works, published in 1784, the passage does not occur in

vol. 2, p. 84; I *think* not in the work anywhere, nor do I believe that Dupin has ever used the above language in any edition. Nor do I believe that the preceding sentence from Cyprian is correct, because it seems to contradict the quotations of other authors from Cyprian on the subject. There are several other quotations, which I believe are spurious, but if they were all genuine, they say nothing to the *point*, and therefore I leave them. I have referred in this manner to Mr. Pond, because he has been brought before this community by one of his own brethren, to prove, 1st, that Mr. Judson became a Baptist from unworthy motives; 2d, to prove that sprinkling and infant affusion have always been practiced in the Christian church. It was necessary, therefore, in examining these lectures, to glance at some facts in the life and writings of Mr. Pond. I have no enmity against Mr. Pond. I should think, from the station which he now occupies, and from some of his writings, over which I have glanced, that he is a man of learning and worth: but it would really seem that one of the principal ingredients in his composition, is prejudice against the principles of the Baptists. And it appears, (if Mr. F. has not misrepresented him,) that he has fallen into some mistakes, and what is a little unfortunate, they all happen to be in favor of *his own cause*.

Again, as Dupin is now mentioned, I will just say that he has given his testimony on the point before us. This is it. Vol. 2, p. 77, "In the *three* first centuries, they plunged those three times whom they baptized." This is definite—it regards the practice of the church for three hundred years after Christ; it is plain, the reader can understand it. And yet it is not believed that trine immersion was practiced so early as the first century.

Finally, with respect to the baptism of Constantine. Some historians say he was twice immersed, once into the Trinitarian faith and once into the Arian creed. Others, that he was baptized but once, and that was by immersion. Thus Robinson, p. 400, says, "It is certain that the Emperor Constantine was baptized at Nicomedia, by immersion." And again, "There is no doubt of

his being immersed, for all parties baptized by immersion then.' Mosheim says, vol. 1, p. 99, "He was baptized a few days before his death, at Nicomedia, by Eusebius, bishop of that place." But he does not say in what manner he was baptized. Now let us hear what Eusebius has to say on the subject. It is a point generally admitted, that he was immersed; but the language of Eusebius proves not only that immersion was the practice of the church, but also that Constantine had intended to be immersed in the river of Jordan, where Christ was baptized; and *also*, that some false notions concerning the efficacy of that rite began to prevail.—At the time of his baptism, Constantine thus addressed the bishops whom he had called together: "This was the time long since hoped for by me, when I thirsted and prayed, that I might obtain salvation in God. This is the hour wherein even we may also enjoy that seal which confers immortality. I had heretofore taken a resolution of doing this in the stream of the river of Jordan, where our Saviour himself, in likeness to us, is recorded to have partaken of the laver."—*Eus. life of Cons. lib. 4, c. 62.* The idea that baptism may mean fifty different things, certainly did not then prevail.—On the whole, this baptism of Constantine must be a great embarrassment to Mr. Fowler's cause.

In the next place, he introduces a man of dignity, a 'Christian and a poet,' as singing in one of his evening songs, 'Worshipper of God, remember that thou didst go under the holy dews of the *font* and laver.' Now really, I am so dull of apprehension, that I cannot possibly imagine what he wishes us to understand from this witness. Certainly I shall not go to the evening song of a poet to learn the common practice of the church with regard to a Christian institution! Was it his object to show that the evening songster here referred to the practice of sprinkling? I think not; for people do not *go under* sprinkling. Besides, if sprinkling was in vogue, what was the use in having *fonts* and lavers in which to immerse? Why erect a font or bath, and then send the candidate under it and sprinkle the holy dews upon him?

It cannot be necessary, and I am sure it would not be *pleasant*, to prosecute this examination of Mr. F.'s witnesses further. They do not favor his cause; there is a host of them, but they throw no light on the subject under examination, viz. 'the practice of the church since the days of the apostles.' They merely give their opinions about what baptism is, and state a few individual cases of clinic baptism. I have shown already that several of his witnesses, when allowed to speak to the point in debate, bear a direct and unequivocal testimony to the fact that *immersion* was the baptism of the primitive church. Such are Cave, Dupin, Calvin, Luther, &c. I will give the reader the decided opinion of Dr. Wall on this subject. Mr. F. has taken quite a number of his scraps from Dr. Wall, to prove that sprinkling prevailed in the early periods of the Christian church. This man is one of the ablest writers of 'their own number.' He received the thanks of a general convocation of the English clergy, for his 'learned and excellent book on infant baptism,' Feb. 8, A. D. 1706. Mr. F. knows, if he knows any thing about his writings, that he was no friend to sprinkling, although a warm advocate for infant baptism. We will hear his testimony concerning primitive practice and the introduction of affusion. "We should not know by these accounts, John iii: 23, Mark i: 5, Acts viii: 38, whether the whole body of the baptized was put under the water, *head and all*, were it not for two later proofs, which seem to me to put it out of question. One is, that St. Paul does twice, in an allusive way of speaking, call baptism a *burial*; which allusion is not so proper, if we conceive them to have gone into the water only up to the arm-pits, &c. as it is if their whole body was immersed. The other, the *custom* of the *near succeeding times*." Here this Pædobaptist historian says something that is in point, and it may be understood. His candidate must not only go '*into* the water up to the arm-pits,' but he must go '*under the water, head and all*.' He arrives at this conclusion, 1st, From scripture accounts of baptism. 2d, Paul's allusion to baptism as a *burial*. 3d, The '*custom of the near succeeding times*.' That this is the way to baptize, he

thinks is evident beyond a doubt. He adds, "As for sprinkling, I say as Mr. Blake said at its first coming up in England, "Let them defend it that use it.'" See *Defence of History of Infant Baptism*, p. 131 to 140.

How much harmony between Mr. F. and his historian! Wall's candidate must go under water *head and all*. Our author at first would not let his step into the 'water an inch deep;' but I perceive that the waters are rising, for in his lectures they have got up to 'six inches deep.' This is encouraging. Who knows but that he may yet take his believing candidate and 'go down into the water,' without guaging its depth by inches? Again, Dr. Wall acknowledges "that those who submitted to the authority of the Pope, were the first to practice pouring and sprinkling; that the English received it from nations who began it in the times of the Pope's power, and that affusion was a 'novelty,' brought into this (English) church by those who learned it in Germany or Geneva." Dr. Wall wrote in the beginning of the 18th century, sprinkling as the practice of the church, was at that time a 'novelty,' brought into the church of England from the Pope, by way of Germany or Geneva. He censures those who deny that immersion was the early practice of the church, because it was a fact so easily proved, that it would injure the cause of Pædobaptism more seriously to *deny* than it would to *own* it; as this denial would excite suspicion that they were uncandid in all the rest of their assertions, and were unwilling to admit plain, undeniable facts, in relation to this affair. It would have been happy for the advocates of affusion, had they profited by this hint of their champion, Dr. Wall. But Mr. F. builds the wall of Pædobaptism so high, and daubs with so much untempered mortar, that it may fall suddenly. See Isai. xxx: 13.

I will refer the reader to one quotation more from Dr. Wall: "France seems to have been the first country in the world where baptism by affusion was used *ordinarily* to persons in health, and in the public way of administering it. It being allowed to weak children (in the reign of queen Elizabeth) to be baptized by aspersion, many fond la-

dies and gentlewomen first, and then, by degrees, the common people would obtain the favor of the priest, to have their children pass for weak children, too tender to endure dipping in the water. As for sprinkling, properly called, it seems it was, at 1645, just then beginning, and used by very few. It must have begun in the disorderly times after '41. They (the assembly of divines at Westminster) reformed the font into a basin. This learned assembly could not remember, that fonts to baptize in, had been always used by the primitive Christians, long before the beginning of popery, and ever since churches were built; but that sprinkling, for the common use of baptizing, was really introduced (in France and other popish countries) in times of popery: and that accordingly, all those countries in which the usurped power of the Pope is, or has formerly been owned, have left off dipping of children in the font; but that all other countries in the world, which had never regarded his authority, do still use it; and that *basins*, except in cases of necessity, were never used by Papists, or any other Christians whatsoever, till by themselves."—See Hist. of Infant Baptism, p. 2, c. 9.

I now dismiss Mr. F.'s witnesses from the stand. The reader cannot fail to see that they embarrass greatly the cause of '*Pædo-affusion*.' But as there is a *phalanx* of them, their numerical power (no matter what they say) will be quite satisfactory to those who have, from the very dawn of their existence, been trammelled by the Abrahamic covenant and the tradition received from their *forefathers*. I am quite willing that the reader should know what well authenticated historians say on this subject. Besides those already examined, I would refer the reader to Milner. I have not his history in hand, but I have read it attentively in by-gone days, and I know that it gives no account of sprinkling in the first two centuries. Milner is on my side. Indeed Mr. F. has not referred to him for proof of the fact that sprinkling or pouring was used by the primitive church. He does endeavor to evade the force of his testimony, and that of Mosheim, Stuart and others in a very curious way. He says these men do not declare 'that immersion was the *only* mode—no, never'! In answer to this sophistical

shuffle I would reply, that as these men declare that ‘immersion was the mode,’ while they say nothing about affusion, they do in effect declare as historians, that—‘this was the *only* mode.’ The Bible says, that Judas went out and hanged himself. But the Bible does not say that this was the only way in which he killed himself—‘no, never.’ Mr. F. may ask, if he pleases, ‘Who knows but that Judas took poison, and cut his throat, and shot himself, and died in half a dozen ways as well as by hanging?’ And perhaps some of his learned and sagacious brethren in the ministry would recommend the question as ‘unanswerable argument.’ And perhaps ‘thousands who are calling for light,’ in the diocese of the Rev. Mr. Waterman, would illumine their understandings and light up their temple by the burning of this precious ‘beaten oil.’ (See Mr. Waterman’s *blazing* recommendation prefixed to these lectures, now under examination.) Mr. Waterman says, ‘that thousands are calling for light on this subject, over which darkness and perversion have so long reigned.’ From the ‘History of a Controversy on Infant Baptism in the Richmond-street Congregational Church,’ which has fallen under my notice, I should think that some in his latitude were in great want of *light*. But if these lectures, which he has *intemperately* recommended, are to become their light, ‘how great will be their darkness!’—I hope that Mr. Waterman will take the same blazing torch, in the light of which he has examined the ‘Christmas Festival and discovered the abominations that cluster around that unscriptural ‘Holiday,’ and scrutinize the practice of infant sprinkling. If he will do this faithfully and in the fear of God, the light of truth will scatter the clouds of Pædobaptist fog and the shades of nocturnal *darkness* which now brood over the subject. I perceive that the learned Council which was called to settle the ‘controversy’ above, decided that ‘the *baptism of infants* is a *symbol of the covenant of grace*’ !! It is a far brighter symbol of *corrupted African christianity*.

Mr. F. says he has ‘consulted the best authorities on both sides,’ and places Mosheim first on the list. He has not, however, quoted a single sentence from this author,

We will now introduce his testimony. He says, page 46, vol. 1, speaking of the practice of the church, ‘The sacrament of baptism was administered in this century (the first) *without* the public assemblies in places appointed and prepared for the purpose, and was performed by an immersion of the whole body in the baptismal font.’ Does this look like sprinkling babes and adults in the meeting-house out of a *basin*? How much easier to procure a basin than to build a font, or prepare a place in which to immerse the whole person? But they did not then even dream that baptizo meant to sprinkle, nor that it had fifty significations! Again, page 69, he gives us a succinct account of the manner in which this rite was performed in the second century, and the subjects to whom it was applied: ‘The sacrament of baptism was administered publicly twice every year, &c. The persons to be baptized, after they had repeated the creed, confessed and renounced their sins, and especially the Devil and all his pompous allurements, *were immersed under water* and received into Christ’s kingdom by a solemn invocation of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, according to the *express* command of our blessed Lord.’ They were not unconscious babes, they were not affused. It is worthy of remark, that in proof of his statement, Dr. Mosheim refers his readers to Dr. Wall and Tertullian on baptism—whereas Mr. F. refers to Wall and Tertullian to prove that affusion was the practice of the church; this is strange, since all of these men were Pædobaptists. What shall be done with the *poor sick body* of infant sprinkling, while the learned Doctors disagree among themselves about the patient? ‘I wot not.’ One thing must be evident to all, that it has of late been dosed unsparingly with *quack remedies*. Mr. Mosheim takes us along to the third century. We perceive that some foolish appendages, some unscriptural drapery began to be added to this simple and glorious rite. Immersion was baptism, but it began to be considered a *saving ordinance*. See page 91, vol. 1. ‘The remission of sins was thought to be its immediate effects.’ Exorcism, that is, casting the Devil out of the candidate, began to prevail. ‘The expulsion of this demon was considered

an essential preparation for baptism, after the administration of which, the candidates returned home, adorned with crowns and arrayed in white garments as sacred emblems; the former, of their victory over sin and the world—the other, of their inward purity and innocence.’ No babes, no basins, no sprinkling yet. But we now see a foundation laid on which to build infant baptism: not the command of God—not apostolic example—not the Abrahamic covenant;—but the belief, that in baptism, sins were remitted, the Devil expelled, and the soul regenerated. Parents will soon wish to have their children saved by being baptized. If it be a saving ordinance, who can blame them? In a note Mosheim says, it is demonstrably evident that exorcism was added to the other baptismal rites in the third century. When men take it upon them to alter, enlarge, or abridge the ordinances of God’s house, how soon may it be said, the glory is departed! The history of baptism should lead us to beware how we ‘add or diminish aught of all that the Lord hath commanded us.’ ‘In the fourth century,’ says Mosheim, ‘baptismal *fonts* were now erected in the porch of each church, for the more commodious administration of that initiatory sacrament.’ No basins, no sprinkling in churches yet. In this century they used, in baptism, *salt*, *unction* and exorcism.

Robinson, in his *History of Baptism*, a work which evinces immense labor and profound research, says, p. 393, after having examined the records, inscriptions, monuments and pictures of the eastern world:—“Immersion, single or trine, was the ordinary mode of baptizing in the Catholic church from the beginning until the Lutheran reformation, and the Lutheran reformers continued it. In regard to the Catholics, the evidence is beyond all contradiction. Canons, manuals, legends, histories and homilies describe it in words: and baptisteries and pictures in misals, describe it in painting.” I would quote largely from him, and present the unanswerable evidences which he has produced to sustain him in this statement; but I have not room, and it cannot be requisite for the satisfaction of unprejudiced minds. For, as Robinson says, page 394:—“Proofs of this kind are so numerous that they would fill

volumes, and so decisive that the fact cannot be denied. In this country (England) ordinary baptism was always understood to mean immersion until after the reformation, and though the private pouring on infants in danger of death was called baptism, yet it was accounted so only by courtesy. Pope Stephen had said, 'If it were a case of necessity, and if it were performed in the name of the Holy Trinity, pouring should be held valid.'” Venema, a learned historian and critic, says, 'It is without controversy that baptism in the primitive church was administered by immersion into water and not by sprinkling, seeing John is said to have baptized *in Jordan*, and where there was much water.'—See Hist. Eccl. Secul 1. sec. 138.

Gregory, and especially Neander, who is acknowledged to have been one of the most profound and impartial historians, declare the same thing with regard to the practice of the Christian church in the first ages—but I have neither time nor room to insert their testimony. Thus we have shown that Wall, Dupin, Cave, Milner, Mosheim, Gregory, Neander, Venema and Robinson, all *authentic historians*, and all, except Robinson, Pædobaptists, declare plainly and positively that baptism was administered in the church for several hundred years by immersion. Mr. Fowler has not produced a particle of evidence from historians to prove that baptism was practised in the church by affusion. I admit that we have on the pages of history, here and there, a case of sprinkling or pouring—but they were cases of sickness and imminent danger, cases of extreme necessity; and no man can claim that affusion was tolerated in the church in the first ages of Christianity, without proving that he is either uncandid, or ignorant on the subject.

I will here present the reader with a quotation from a standard Pædobaptist work, 'which now lies before me,' entitled, 'An elementary course of Biblical Theology, translated from the works of Professors Storr and Platt, with additions by S. S. Schmucker, A. M. Professor of Theology in the Theological Seminary of the General Synod of the Evangelical Lutheran Church in the United States. Gettysburg, Pa.'; vol. 2, pages 290, 291.

“4. *The primitive mode was probably by immersion.* The disciples of our Lord could understand his command in no other manner, than as enjoining immersion; for the baptism of John, to which Jesus himself submitted, and also the earlier baptism (John iv: 1) of the disciples of Christ, was performed by *dipping* the subject into cold water; *as is evident from the following passages:—Matt. iii: 6, ‘(*ebaptizonto en to Jordane*) were baptized in Jordan.’ Verse 16, ‘(*Iesous anebe apo tou udatos*) Jesus ascended out of the water.’ John iii: 23, ‘(*oti udata polla en ekei*) because there was much water there.’ And that they did understand it so, is proved partly by those passages of the New Testament which evidently allude to *immersion*.—Acts viii: 36, &c.—39, ‘(*ote anebesan ek tou udatos*) when they had come out of the water.’ Romans vi: 4, ‘(*sunetaphemen auto [to Christo] dia tou baptismatos ina osper egerthe Christos ek nekron*) are buried with him (Christ) by baptism, so that as Christ was raised from the dead,’ &c. Compare Col. ii: 12, and I. Peter iii: 21, where baptism is termed the *antitype* of the flood. And partly from the fact that immersion was so customary in the ancient church, that even in the third century, the baptism of the sick, who were merely sprinkled with water, was entirely neglected by some, and by others thought to be inferior to the baptism of those who were in health, and who received baptism not merely by aspersion, but who actually bathed themselves in water.* This is evident from Cyprian, epis. 69, ed. Bremæ, page 185, &c. And Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. lib. 6, cap. 43, where we find the following extract from the letter of the Roman bishop Cornelius. ‘Novatus received baptism on a sick bed by aspersion (*perichuthesis*), if it can be said that such a person received baptism.’ No person who had, during sickness, been baptized by aspersion, was admitted to the clerical office.’ ‘Moreover, the *old custom* of immersion was also retained a long time in the Western church, at least in the case of

* The translator has not done justice here to the original of Prof. Storr; but take the passage as it is, it condemns Mr. F.’s notion.—The original is more pointed.

those not indisposed. And even after aspersion had been fully introduced into some of the Western churches, there yet remained several, who for some time adhered to the ancient custom. Under these circumstances it is certainly to be lamented that Luther was not able to accomplish his wish with regard to the introduction of immersion, as he had done in the restoration of wine in the Eucharist."

How widely these learned Professors differ from Mr. Fowler about the meaning of scripture passages, the use of Greek prepositions, and the custom of the ancient church, and the testimony of Cyprian! How differently they quote the passage from Eusebius concerning the baptism of Novatus. See his 55th page. The reader will draw his own conclusions.

I will call your attention to a few extracts from Prof. Stuart, and then leave this part of the subject. He says, page 355, 'It is not my intention here to make a very copious selection of testimonies. An appropriate number, well chosen and from good authorities, will satisfy the reasonable desires of every intelligent reader.' He then refers to the pastor of Hermas, Justin Martyr and Tertullian, pages 355, 6, 7, and says, 'I do not see how any doubt can remain that in Tertullian's time the practice of the African church, to say the least, as to the mode of baptism, must have been that of trine immersion.' Strange that Mr. F. should bring forward Tertullian to prove affusion, and Prof. Stuart the same man to prove immersion! I shall cheerfully leave the reader and the public to judge which of these two men possesses the most discernment and candor: but I am compelled in truth to say, that every history which I ever read sustains Prof. Stuart and condemns Mr. Fowler's position. I have no disposition, however, to balance their respective merits, or to determine which has the best claim to public confidence.—There is in this case this simple but very important difference: Stuart selects passages from Tertullian which are directly in point—whereas Mr. F. refers to a passage which has no bearing on the subject. And the query, Is this witness in point? Or is it irrelevant? is a question of vast interest to an honorable reasoner or a fair disputant.

Again, says Stuart, page 357, ‘Subsequent ages make the general practice of the church still plainer, if indeed this can be done. The Greek words *kataduo* and *kataduis* were employed as expressive of baptizing and baptism; and these words mean *going down into the water*, or *immersing*. So in the following examples.’ Here he gives decisive examples from Chrysostom, Ambrose, Augustine, Dionysius, and the council of Toletan. He says, p. 358, “The passages which refer to immersion are so numerous in the fathers, that it would take a little volume merely to recite them.”

Stuart, after referring to Gregory, Photius, Chrysostom, Cyril of Jerusalem, Jerome and others, says—“But enough. ‘It is, says Augusti (Denkw. 7th, p. 216) a thing made out,’ viz. the ancient practice of immersion.’ So indeed *all* the writers who have thoroughly investigated this subject, conclude. [Mr. Fowler’s lectures had not been published when Stuart wrote his treatise.] I know of no one usage of ancient times, which seems to be more clearly and certainly made out. I cannot see how it is *possible* for any candid man who examines the subject, to deny this.” I will here insert a passage of Mr. F. on the same subject precisely. After quoting his authorities, who say nothing to *the point*, he says on p. 58, “Here we have the *united* testimony of many distinguished men, ecclesiastical historians and others, reaching back to the very age in which the apostles lived, that baptism by *affusion* has *always* for *eighteen hundred years* been practiced in the Christian church. * * For myself I can entertain no doubt on the subject; and I see not how any unprejudiced mind can doubt”! ‘*Lord, what is man?*’ What a real ignoramus, what a prejudiced partisan, must Prof. Stuart be, in the estimation of our Fall River lecturer! I do hope that Pædobaptists in this vicinity will look to this subject a little, and not suffer themselves to be imposed upon in this matter. S. proceeds, p. 359, “That there were cases of exception allowed, now and then, is no doubt true. Per-

sons in extreme sickness or danger were allowed baptism by affusion, etc.” He then mentions some who had plead for clinic baptism, and speaks of two particular cases by Lawrence or Laurence, who baptized the man ‘with a pitcher of water,’ which Mr. F. mentions with so much gravity on p. 55 ; and then says, ‘But all such cases were manifestly regarded as *exceptions* to the common usage of the church.’

The public may here perceive, 1st. That Prof. Stuart sustains me in my remark about the irrelevancy of Mr. F.’s testimony, because he acknowledges that these few cases of clinic baptism were manifest ‘exceptions to common usage,’ whereas Mr. F. brought them forward to prove the practice of the church since the days of the Apostles.—*See his 54th page.* 2d. The reader will perceive that Mr. F. has *misrepresented* Prof. Stuart on his 116th page, because Stuart does no where claim that ‘affusion or aspersion’ were practiced only in cases of extreme ‘sickness or danger, where *immersion could not be practiced.*’ Finally says this erudite and candid Professor, p. 362, ‘In what manner then did the churches of Christ from a very early period, to say the least, understand the word baptizo in the New Testament? Plainly they construed it as meaning immersion. * * Still we are left in *no doubt* as to the more generally received usage of the Christian church, down to a period several centuries after the apostolic age.”

Thus, reader, I have given you a candid view of Prof. Stuart’s intelligent and irrefutable conclusion with regard to the practice of the primitive church. I must say that I was astonished and distressed when Mr. F. proposed to prove from history that affusion was the practice of the church in the apostolic age, and had been ever since! He might as well attempt to prove transubstantiation. Prof. Woods says in his lectures on baptism, “Ecclesiastical history is the only *conclusive* argument in favor of immersion.” How can there be such a difference of opinion on this subject, between Mr. F. and the Andover professors? The solemn truth is, there is not an intelligent, candid Pædobaptist in

the land, who has examined this subject thoroughly, that will attempt to contradict what these Professors have said on this point, or to sustain Mr. F. in his position.

We have now followed him through his preliminary remarks, classic usage, lexicographic and historical testimony, and find that he has not by fair argumentation obtained one inch of solid ground, on which to base the practice of sprinkling. He has indeed summoned witnesses enough to prove anything, if their testimony were but in point. But the misfortune is, their testimony is irrelevant and contradictory. Many of them have been misrepresented, and when cross-examined, bear witness directly against him. It is also a *lamentable* truth, that when he calls our attention to Greek classic usage, he quotes the Latin fathers. When he wishes us to hear what lexicographers say, he refers us to Buck, Brown and Leigh, who are not lexicographers. For historians, we are presented with men who never wrote a history—and his '*learned Greek critics*' are enough to excite a smile on the countenance of any thorough scholar in New England. I will only remark, that Mr. F. has evidently "a *bad cause*, or he does not know how to defend a *good one*." But with many he will undoubtedly succeed, for sprinkling can be sustained by anything which bears the name of argument, so far and so long as it is popular.

CHAPTER VI.

TESTIMONY OF HISTORIANS RESPECTING THE BAPTISM OF INFANTS.

MR. F. undertakes, page 82, to prove from Ecclesiastical History that infant baptism has prevailed in the church ever since the apostolic age. He says, 'This I shall do from the most ample testimony.' On this subject I remark, 1st. I have no disposition to contend with him about the *occasional* baptism of babes after the commencement of the third century. If he can prove that it prevailed after that period, or even before, it will avail him nothing, unless he can present us with an inspired command or plain apostolic example. We must have some better authority than the decision of *bishops*, or *councils*, or the *Pope*, before we solemnize a rite in which we use the awful names of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost. 2d. I object to the manner in which he introduces his witnesses. 'Such a man born about fifty years after the apostles,' &c. But why date from a man's birth? Why say fifty years after the apostles? Why not say the middle of the second century? It would seem that there was in this case a design to deceive the reader, by giving the impression that the witness lived and wrote nearer to the days of Christ than he did in fact. 'One hundred and fifty years after the apostles,' seems, at first view, to be earlier than the middle of the third century; but it is not in reality, because he reckons one hundred years for the apostolic age. 3d. His witnesses say nothing in point. But as they have been introduced to the stand and sworn with all formality, they must be briefly examined. The first is Justin Martyr. He says, 'There are among us of both sexes, some sixty and some seventy years of age, who were made disciples of Christ from their childhood.' Very well: what has this to do with infant baptism? But Mr. F. explains: 'Justin uses the very word, *emathetcuthesan*, which Christ had used in his commission to the apostles to go and *disciple* all nations, baptizing them, &c.' This is true, Mr. F.;

and it proves conclusively to all who have good sense and are disposed to use it, that the language will bear no application to unconscious babes. How will you proceed to teach or disciple a babe? But he proceeds: 'Justin therefore understood the command of Christ to make disciples and baptize, as applicable to little children.' Justin has *said* no such thing; and how does Mr. F. know what his views were on this subject any farther than *he* has expressed them? But look at the sentence carefully; 'to make disciples and baptize,' '*applicable to little children.*' Mr. F. adds, 'And there never was any other method of making disciples from infancy but by baptism'! Now let Mr. F. go to work. 1st, He must '*make disciples and baptize*;' a disciple is a follower of Christ—a Christian. Can he make Christians of little children, by teaching or instructing them? The disciples '*must be made*, and then baptized.' Thus reads the commission. So reads the sentence above. If Mr. F. makes disciples of children, will they not bear the image of their maker? There is a way to make disciples of those who are capable of understanding moral subjects, and can feel the influence of moral suasion. That is, *instrumentally*, we may teach and instruct and persuade and induce them to become disciples. But how this instrumentality can be used efficiently in the case of babes, I have yet to learn. 'O how can the Baptists be so stupid?' 'The way to make disciples from infancy is by *baptizing* them.' O this is it. 'Make disciples and baptize.' That is, make '*disciples by baptizing* them'! Well, after all, I cannot understand it. But Mr. F. can, for he sounds the note of triumph. 'This is an explicit testimony, that infant baptism was practiced before John died'! These are his very words. How *logical*, how *fair*, how *conclusive his reasoning*! I am sorry to have found a minister of the gospel, for whom I would cherish sentiments of respect, employed in giving circulation to such glaring sophisms. The language of Justin Martyr has nothing to do with infant baptism. The word here used by him, which is translated childhood, and on which so much *stress* is laid, and which Mr. F. has called '*infancy*,' is the genitive plural of '*pais*,' which means a

child. It is also used for 'a son,' without respect to age. It is used for 'a servant or an attendant.' The Latin version or translation of Justin, in the London edition of his works, has the words '*qui a pueris*,' 'who from boys.' The fact is, Justin said no more than I can say, in truth, of the First Baptist Church in Fall River: 'We have some *among us* who were made disciples or *have been* disciples from youth, from childhood.' But they were not made disciples by baptism. Nor was there ever a disciple of Christ made in any denomination by being baptized. The idea is too absurd to need a refutation. This is a fair sample of Mr. Fowler's '*explicit* testimony;' which is scattered up and down in these lectures.

Justin Martyr, in his apology for the Christians, addressed to Antonius Pius, gives us a description of baptism and of the candidates who submitted to it, in the following words: "I will now inform you of the manner in which, on our conversion, we dedicate ourselves to God, through Christ; lest if I omitted this, my address might be suspected of insincerity. Whoever are convinced of the truth of our doctrine, and live under its influence, are first directed to pray with fasting and seek from God the pardon of their sins; we uniting with them in these exercises. Then we bring them to a place of water, and there they are new born, as we were, for they are washed in the name of God, the Father of all, and of our Lord Jesus Christ and of the Holy Spirit." The object of Justin was to defend the Christians against certain reports which had been circulated by their enemies. And as he professed to give a sincere and impartial account of the manner in which by baptism, they dedicated themselves to God, and as he says not a word about the dedication or baptism of children, the inference is fair (I think) that infant baptism was not practiced by the church at that time: viz. about the middle of the second century.

2nd. Iræneus wrote in the last half of the second century. A passage is quoted from him to prove, that infant baptism was then in use. Here it follows: "Christ passed through every age; for infants he became an infant, that he might sanctify infants." And again he says:

“Christ came to save all persons who by him are born again unto God, infants and little ones, and children and youth, and elder persons.” Mr. F. comments on this quotation thus: “By being born again (*venascunter*) Iræneus as he himself clearly shows elsewhere, means being baptized. This passage furnishes *full proof* that infant baptism was the prevailing practice of the church in his day—only *fifty* or *sixty years* after the apostles!” Now let us take the dissecting knife to this passage which affords “*full proof* that infant baptism, was the prevailing practice, only *fifty* or *sixty years* after the apostles.” In the first place, Iræneus died after the commencement of the third century, 202. And Dr. Wall, who claims this passage as genuine, acknowledges that it was not written until *one hundred and eighty years* after Christ. Second, this passage is generally considered *spurious*, and of course is good for nothing, unless it be to support a spurious baptism. In this passage we have not the original words of Iræneus, but are dependant on a *miserable version*.—Dupin and Dr. Gale and others, have given sufficient proof that this passage is spurious. See Dr. Gale p. 464.—Dupin vol. 1 pages 67, 68 and 71. Ency. Americana vol. 7 p. 61. The passage is not entitled to notice in this debate. 3d. If it were genuine, it has not the least reference to infant baptism. The translator has used the word (*renasci*) which could not have been intended to mean baptized, because this being born again was performed by Christ, “who by him are born again to God.”—Are men or babes, ‘by Christ baptized unto God’? Again, does baptism save the soul? ‘Christ came to *save all* who are by him *baptized* unto God’! I am sure Mr. F. on reviewing this matter cannot be proud of his witness. And how reckless is the positive assertion that this passage affords “*full proof* of the prevalence of infant baptism only *fifty* or *sixty years* after the apostles.” When by Pædobaptist consent, Iræneus wrote *one hundred and eighty years* after Christ. This passage is spurious. And if it were genuine, it says nothing at all concerning infant baptism.—It simply declares that Christ came to save *all* who are renewed by his spirit, and no others, and that by assuming

our nature, and passing through the several stages of life; he has sanctified them and set an example to men of every age. The passage does not militate against my views in the least. There is nothing in the passage, or in the preceding or following words, that has the least reference to infant baptism. I should despise the idea of resorting to such testimony to support my cause. Testimony which neither mentions nor involves the pending question.— Surely there must have been a great ‘paucity’ of direct substantial historic evidence in this case, or Mr. F. would not have brought forward again, these *stale mouldy scraps*, from Justin Martyr, Iræneus, Origen, &c.

3d. Next comes Tertullian, the first Latin father that mentions infant baptism, and Mr. F. admits that he opposed it. He says, however, that he ‘opposed the common opinion.’ This statement is mere assertion; it is not correct; I challenge the proof—and I am confident that no substantial evidence can be produced, to show that infant baptism was the common practice of the church at that time. We have already examined the best proof which he could produce, and he has taken unwearied pains; see his 112th page. I have heretofore supposed, by reading the few sentences from Tertullian, as they have been bandied about by writers on both sides of this subject, that as he is the first man who mentions infant baptism, so he was in fact speaking of the baptism of *little babes*. But a recent and more thorough examination of the subject, by the help of Robinson and others, has led me to the conclusion that Tertullian was treating of the baptism of children who were capable of *asking* for baptism. The case was this, says Robinson: ‘Quintilla, a lady of fortune, of the town of Pepuza, requests that the little children under her care might be baptized, in case that they requested it, and obtained sponsors. Tertullian, a prudent *lawyer* in the church at Carthage, opposed the plan, and assigned his objections.’ Those who wish to obtain a knowledge of this whole business, and have all the circumstances of infant baptism in Tertullian’s day fully exhibited, will be gratified in perusing Mr. Robinson’s History of Baptism, from pp. 136 to 206. I would

quote several passages from him, but I cannot do him justice unless I embody most of his evidences on the subject, and they would occupy much room; and as this is not necessary in examining the lectures before us, or in vindicating my cause, I leave it. It belongs to those who practice infant baptism, to show plainly how they came by it, and by what authority they use it. It must be evident to all, that Tertullian does not help the cause of infant baptism. For if it was the baptism of *unconscious babes*, that he meant, he evidently opposed it, which he certainly would not have done, if it had been a common practice of the church. As he is the first father who *mentioned* and at the same time opposed the practice, it is evident almost as demonstration, that whether he referred to the baptism of little babes, or catechumens, (or as we should say, charity scholars,) the practice was then for the first time proposed, and that Tertullian, as a prudent man, foresaw the evils which would result, and opposed the measure, and gave his reasons. The assertion of Dr. Dwight and Mr. Fowler, that “the reason why Tertullian proposed the *delay* of baptizing infants was, that he attributed to baptism an importance not given to it in scripture,” carries improbability on its very face. Those who believed that baptism was a saving ordinance—that remission of sins was the immediate effect of it, wished that their children might receive ‘this seal, which confers immortality.’ And if Tertullian believed this doctrine, he must have been an *unfeeling* monster, to oppose infant baptism! What! deny regeneration to children, and let them sink to hell for the want of baptism? This is the slanderous report which has sometimes been circulated about the Baptists. ‘They attribute an importance not given to it in the scriptures; they make it a saving ordinance!’ Because, forsooth, they oppose, like Tertullian, the baptism of babes and unbelieving adults. In other words, they consider baptism a saving ordinance, because they insist upon it that men must be saved from the love of sin, and brought to believe in Christ, before they are suitable candidates for that sacred rite!! That they should

become Christians before they put on the *badge* of Christianity.

Next comes Origen; 'who was born about 85 years after the apostles.' He was born A. D. *one hundred and eighty-five*, and died 253, past the middle of the third century. He is represented as saying, "According to the usage of the church, baptism is given (*etiam parvelus*) even to infants." And again, 'Infants are baptized for the remission of sins, and because, by baptism, native pollution is taken away, therefore infants are baptized.' And again, 'The church received an order from the apostles to give baptism even to infants.' Mr. F. says, this 'testimony is *clear and explicit*.' Let us look at this.

1st. Does he believe that infants are 'baptized for the remission of sins?' Does he think that, *by baptism, native pollution is taken away?* and 'therefore infants are baptized'? If he does *not* believe it, then why did he bring a *lying* witness into court? Mr. F. can seize which horn of the dilemma he chooses.

2d. The word *parvelus* is too indefinite to render this testimony 'clear and explicit.' It might refer to an infant in nature, or an infant in law; that is, any minor under age.

3d. The 'church received an order from the apostles to baptize little children.' Yes, and not only infant baptism, but *infant communion*, and *exorcism*, and *Episcopacy*, and all the errors of *Romanism*, we are told on authority quite as good, were all received from the apostles!! Why does not Mr. F. embrace all the apostolic traditions? Why does he reject Romanism? Why does he not practice *infant communion*? Cyprian, Jerome, Austin, and Pope Innocent, and others, plead as warmly for infant communion, and they gave as good reasons as they did, and as good reasons as Mr. F. can give for *infant baptism*. But away with such authority. 'The Bible is the religion of Protestants.'

4. These passages are not in any of the writings of Origen. They are taken from a translation by Ruffinus and Jerome, in the latter part of the fourth century, when infant baptism had become somewhat popular, and the

church was almost overwhelmed with delusive errors. These translators by their own acknowledgment have altered and abridged and enlarged the works of Origen, according to their own pleasure. Mr. F. knows or should know that the first scholars and the most enlightened reasoners on this subject, both in Europe and America, have declared that there are in this translation of the works of Origen so many 'changes, omissions and interpolations', as to ruin its authority—since we can 'hardly find Origen in Origen.' His proof from this source will not be admitted as having the least weight. Should Mr. F. or the reader wish for evidence to sustain me in the above remarks concerning the spuriousness of these passages from Origen, I refer him to the writings of Mosheim and Dupin, Pædobaptists, and to Drs. Gale, Gill and Chapin, Baptists.

Next comes Cyprian and the august council of Carthage, composed of sixty-six bishops, over which it was the honor of Cyprian to preside. Mr. F. appeals to this council with as much apparent confidence as he would to the 'twelve Apostles of the Lamb.' Milner speaks very highly of Cyprian, and calls this council a *holy assembly*, while Robinson, on the other hand, declares that 'Cyprian was an ignorant fanatic, and as great a tyrant as ever lived.' The truth, probably, lies about mid-way between these these two historians. One thing is certain, that the page of history pays no great compliment to the wisdom or theology of Cyprian. And the questions which were brought forward and solved by this venerable body of sixty-six bishops, show very plainly that clouds dark and dense hovered over the minds of these African clergymen. I might amuse the reader (for I have the documents before me) with a detailed account of that holy assembly, as given by Robinson and others—but I forbear. I wish the reader to come at the simple truth in the case, and not be swerved by the *one-sided* comments of historians. I think, therefore, the happier way will be to present the decisions of that council as *written by themselves*, ask the reader a few questions for his own solution, and leave the subject.

This council convened in the year 253. The result of this council was sent to one Fidus, who wished to know at what age infants should be baptized. He could find no law in the Bible, nor in the examples of the church, to solve his scruples. Now, reader, I ask, is it not strange, if infant baptism had been in use from the days of Christ, and is supported by plain scripture, ‘that Fidus should not have learned by the unanimous and uninterrupted practice of the church, that the age of the infant was not essential as it respected the due reception of this rite.’ But Fidus had another difficulty, quite as serious as the first. He rather thought that infants should be baptized on the eighth day; but if the council determined that it should be done before eight days, then he knew not what to do—for it was the custom to kiss the persons newly baptized, and infants were reputed unclean the first seven days, and therefore people did not like to kiss them. Now, reader, I do not ask whether this Fidus was an honest and good man, but I do ask, was he a very *intelligent* bishop? But we will now see how this enlightened council of Carthage—this ‘*holy assembly*’, relieved his conscience. I will give you the decision of the council, as it came from their own hands, entire. Neither Robinson, Milner nor Fowler, have given to the public the whole article. If I do not give it correctly myself, some one, perhaps, will call me to an account. And if it shall be proved incorrect, I will call on the venerable Dr. Chapin, President of Columbian College in the city of Washington, as I take the article from his pen.

The council of Carthage addressed Fidus thus: “As for the matter of infants, whom you said were not to be baptized within the second or third day after their nativity, or, according to the law of circumcision, within the eighth day thereof, it hath appeared to us in council quite contrary—no one maintaining your opinion; but we all judged that the mercy and grace of God was to be denied to no *man*; for since the Lord said in the gospel, the Son of man came not to destroy but to save the souls of *men*, therefore, as much as lies in our power, no soul is to be lost; for what is there defective in him who has since

been formed in the womb by the hand of God? To us, indeed, it seems that children increase as they advance in years; but yet whatever things are made by God, are perfected by the work and majesty of God their maker. Besides, the holy scriptures declare that both infants and adult persons have the same equality in the divine workmanship. When Elisha prayed over the dead child of the Shunamitish widow, he lay upon the child, and put his head upon his head, and his face upon his face, and his body upon his body, and his feet upon his feet. This may be thought improbable, how the small members of an infant should equal the big ones of a grown man; but herein is expressed the *divine and spiritual equality*; that all *men* are equal and alike when they are made by God; that though the increase of our bodies may cause an inequality with respect to man, yet not with respect to God, unless that *that grace* is given to baptized persons, be more or less according to the age of the receivers; but the Holy Ghost is given *equally to all*, not according to measure, but according to God's mercy and indulgence; for as God is no respecter of persons, so neither of years; he equally offers to all, the obtaining of his heavenly grace. And whereas you say, that an infant for the first days after birth is unclean, so that every one is afraid to kiss him, this can be no impediment to his obtainment of heavenly grace; for it is written, to the pure all things are pure, and none of us should dread that which God hath made; for although an infant be newly born, yet he is not so as that we should dread to kiss him; since in the kissing of an infant, we ought to think upon the *fresh marks of God*, which in a manner we kiss in an infant newly born, when we embrace that which God hath made. And whereas the carnal Jewish circumcision was performed on the eighth day, that was a type and shadow of some good thing, which Christ the truth being now come, is done away; because the eighth day, or the first after the Sabbath, was to be the day on which our Lord should rise and quicken us, and give us the spiritual circumcision, therefore was the carnal circumcision on the eighth day, which type is now abolished, Christ the truth being come, and

having given us the spiritual circumcision. Wherefore it is our judgment that no one ought to be debarred from God's *grace* by that law, or that the spiritual circumcision should be hindered by the carnal one, but *all men* ought to be admitted to the grace of Christ, as Peter saith in the Acts of the Apostles, that the Lord said unto him, that he should call no *man* common or unclean. But if any thing hinder men from baptism, it will be heinous sins that will debar the adult and mature therefrom; and if those who have sinned extremely against God, yet, if afterwards they believe, are baptized, and no man is prohibited from this *grace*; how much more ought not an infant to be prohibited, who by being just born, is guilty of no sin but original, which is contracted from Adam? Who ought the more readily to be received to the *remission* of sins, because not his own, but others are remitted to him. Wherefore, dearly beloved, it is our opinion, that from baptism and the grace of God, who is merciful and kind, and benign to all, none ought to be prohibited by us, which as it is to be observed and followed with respect to *all*, so *especially* with respect to infants, and those that are but just born, who deserve our help and the divine mercy, because at the *first instant* of their nativity, *they beg it by their cries and tears!*" See Dr. Chapin's strictures on Mr. Moore's reply, published in 1820.

Now, reader, I may be allowed to ask, 1. Was not this a very sage council? 2. Did they not use logical arguments? 3. Did they not make a curious application of scripture passages? 4. Did they not make a very happy disposal of the rite of circumcision? 5. Is it a fact that in the sight of God infants are big as men? 6. Is it a fact that children come into the world crying for baptism? 7. Will delicate ladies be likely to approve of this Pædobaptist Theology, which was brought forth by the council of Carthage, A. D. 253, and pronounced clean at its birth? 8. Has Mr. F. any great reason to be proud of his council of sixty-six bishops? 9. Are not the arguments employed by that *august* body about as valuable, and their applications of scripture about as correct, as his

own in the lectures before us? 10. And, finally, had we not better reverence the Bible more, and the decisions of priests and councils and the fathers less?

Baptism is a plain, simple, glorious rite; it is an institution of heaven. And this is a subject which may not be trifled with. We cannot refuse to examine it seriously and prayerfully, without subjecting ourselves to the charge of disrespect for the authority of Christ. It appears to me that the man who candidly and thoroughly investigates this matter, will find unquestionable proof that infant baptism took its rise in Africa in the third century. Some plead for it for one reason, and some for another—but the principal, the prevailing argument was that it was a saving ordinance. This false doctrine, which crept into the African churches, laid the foundation for the rite of infant baptism. Mr. Fowler's witnesses, if they prove any thing, prove that this false doctrine prevailed. See the testimonies of Origen, Cyprian, Optatus, Gregory, Ambrose, Chrysostom, &c. on his 84th, 85th and 86th pages. They called it the 'remission of sins', 'the heavenly grace of baptism', 'sanctification', 'the grace of God', 'regeneration'. Chrysostom, especially, considered those very stupid who thought that baptism '*consisted only in forgiveness of sins*, for he had reckoned up *ten* advantages of it.' When it had once come into use, they began to justify its continuance by various and contradictory arguments. And thus it has been ever since. If Pædobaptists were generally agreed among themselves what ground to take in defending infant baptism, their arguments might then have some appearance of plausibility, and some claim to our notice. But they differ widely. The Catholics do not claim to have scripture authority for the practice, but baptize infants because certain councils decreed that it should be done. The church of England holds infant baptism on the ground of the promises made for the infant by godfathers and godmothers—yet many Episcopal writers think differently. 'Wall, Seldon and Hammond, found the right of infants principally on proselyte baptism.' Some, as the Lutherans, hold that infants have 'a sort of faith.' Some make the faith of *parents* the con-

dition of children to membership and salvation, as did Baxter. Henry makes a confession of faith by parents the infant's title to baptism. Some refer to Abrahamic covenant and circumcision—some to 'holy children.' Some assert that children are in a 'relative state of grace.' Some hold that by baptism children are 'brought into the covenant of grace'; others that they are in the covenant before baptism. Some assert one thing, and some another. This is a strong proof that infant baptism is unauthorized by the Bible. The Baptists for eighteen hundred years have had but one short, plain, simple, uniform, evangelical story to tell on this subject. 'He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.'

Mr. F. has quoted a sentence from the 'Apostolic constitutions' to prove the right of children to baptism.—*See 85th page.* I am surprised that he should have done so. If he had only consulted one of his 'Greek lexicographers,' to wit, Buck's Theological Dictionary, page 23, he would have seen that they are spurious, and have long since been rejected by his own brethren. I shall not accept that authority to prove infant baptism, which the advocates of that rite have themselves denounced as decidedly spurious.

Mr. F. quotes Pelagius with great confidence, as affording unanswerable proof in favor of infant baptism. But if he will take the trouble to examine the testimony of Pelagius for himself, and not depend on 'another man's line of things made ready to his hand', he will perceive that he has misrepresented Pelagius. The grand dispute between him and Austin was about *native depravity*, and not about *infant baptism*. True he did not deny infant baptism. But whoever examines the dispute between him and Austin carefully, will discover that he never said or meant to say, that 'he never heard any one, no, not even an impious heretic, deny infant baptism.' But he said that 'he had never heard, no, not even an impious heretic or sectary say, that the kingdom of heaven could be obtained without the redemption of Christ'. Austin had charged two things upon Pelagius:—1st. Denying baptism of infants; 2d. Promising them the kingdom of

heaven without the redemption of Christ. To both of these he replies. But when he used the language above cited, he evidently referred to the last of these slanders. For a further illustration of this subject, see *Chapin's Strictures on Rev. Mr. Moore's Reply*, page 56. This main pillar of historic evidence in favor of infant baptism crumbles away on examination.

But I have already traced him farther than I intended on this subject. I grant that infant baptism was practiced after the second century—but I do not admit that there is any thing in the command of God, or the practice of the Apostles, nor in the *history* of the first two centuries, which justifies the practice. And Mr. F. has utterly failed to produce any good evidence to prove what I deny. Hence this sentence on 88th page is worse than *bombast*:— ‘Thus, my hearers, I have placed before you evidence, as full and specific and certain as the best authentic histories furnish of *any fact*, that infant baptism prevailed *universally* from the days of the Apostles through the first four centuries. During that period no one denied it—no one wrote against it. Now what shall we do with all this *blaze* of evidence respecting the universal practice of the primitive church’!!! ‘*Profundo largiter!*’ Let me modestly ask, does he not say on page 83, that Tertullian directly *opposed* the common opinion? But now he has become so strongly charged with theological electricity, that in the *tremendous* explosion—infant baptism is the *universal practice* of the church, and for four centuries *no one* denied, *no one* wrote against it!! And then this *blaze* of evidence! Reader, do go back, if you think that you can bear the light of this focus which seems to have converged all the bright rays of heaven to this single point, and examine these evidences once more. I have followed him down to the fourth or fifth century, and weighed his evidences. I have been neither burned nor bedazzled by this ‘*blaze*,’ bright and burning as it is. I could live in such a blaze all the days of my life, without the least inconvenience. I do not believe that there will **not** be ‘a hair of my head singed, nor the smell of fire pass upon me,’ after going through this heated theological

furnace ! The only witnesses that he has brought forward previous to the third century, are Justin Martyr and Iræneus, who say not a word about infant baptism—for this good reason, that no such practice then prevailed. Is it at all strange that no one denied it in the first two centuries ? Did any one deny episcopacy, or infant communion, or exorcism, or unction, or transubstantiation, in the first two hundred years after Christ ? If there were *none* in the third and fourth centuries that opposed infant baptism, and if it was the *universal* practice of the church, how came Tertullian to oppose it, in his book written at the commencement of the third century ? How happened it that Gregory, bishop of Constantinople, and Nectarius his successor, and others born of Christian parents, were not baptized till they arrived at manhood ? Who can account for the fact that sermons were delivered to whole congregations of youth, by Basil, Nazianzen and others, in which they were urged to be baptized ? Must not these men have been Baptists, and were not the parents of these youth Baptists ? ‘How will it be accounted for that when a council assembled at Carthage, in the beginning of the fifth century, and anathematized all those who refused to baptize infants, there were four hundred churches in Africa that refused to comply with this edict, and were persecuted to extermination ?’ But the reader will think and examine and judge for himself.

1. *Salmasius*.—‘An opinion prevailed that no one could be saved without being baptized, and for *that reason* the custom arose of baptizing infants.’ Again : ‘In the two first centuries, *no one* was baptized, except being instructed in the faith and acquainted with the doctrine of Christ, he was able to profess himself a believer.’ But who was Salmasius ? He was an ‘eminent French scholar,’ was educated at Paris and Hiedleberg ; his ‘knowledge of languages was extensive, and such was his memory, that he retained whatever he once heard or read. He succeeded Scaliger at the University at Leyden. His printed works amount to *eighty* in number, and he left *sixty* in manuscript, and as many unfinished.’—See Davenport’s Biographical Dictionary, p. 447.

2. *Curcellæus*.—He was a learned professor of divinity. “The baptism of infants in the two first centuries after Christ was *altogether unknown*; but in the third and fourth centuries was allowed by some. In the fifth and following ages it was *generally* received. The custom of baptizing infants did *not begin* before the third age after Christ was born. In the former ages, *no trace* of it appears; and it was introduced without the command of Christ.”

3. *Venema*.—“Nothing can be affirmed with certainty concerning the practice of the church before Tertullian, seeing there is not, that I know of, any where in more ancient writers, undoubted mention of infant baptism.”

4. *Episcopius*.—“Pædobaptism *was not accounted* a necessary rite, till it was determined so to be in the Milevetan council, held in the year 418.”

5. *Bishop Barlow*.—“I believe and *know* that there is neither precept nor example in the scriptures for Pædobaptism, nor any just evidence of it for two hundred years after Christ.”

6. *Luther*.—“It cannot be proved by the sacred scriptures that infant baptism was instituted by Christ or began by the first Christians after the apostles.”

7. *M. Formey*.—“They baptized from this time, (the last part of the second century,) *infants* as well as adults.”

8. *Grotius*.—“It seems to me that the baptism of infants was, of old, much more frequently practiced in Africa than in Asia. You will not find in any of the councils a more ancient mention of this custom, than in the council of Carthage.”

9. *American Encyclopedia*, vol. 1, p. 224. “It is *certain* that infant baptism was not customary in the earliest periods of the Christian church.”

10. *Ibid.* p. 558. “In the first centuries of the Christian era, when, generally speaking, adults only joined the new sect, the *converted* were diligently instructed; the power of this sacrament to procure perfect remission of sins, was taught. * * But the doctrine of St. Augustine,

that all the unbaptized were *irrevocably* damned, changed this delay into *haste*, and made the *baptism of children* general."

Augustine lived in the latter part of the fourth, and the first part of the fifth centuries. Mr. F. says 'he *flourished* 288 years after the apostles.' But he does not mention his flourishes about *infant communion*.

Now, reader, you will recollect that these witnesses *were not Baptists*, and of course they were not prejudiced in favor of Baptist sentiments from party feeling. What but an honest conviction of TRUTH could have induced them to bring in a verdict against themselves—a testimony that militates against their own practice? Mr. F.'s witnesses are all men of his own order. Some of them do not in their testimony even *involve* the pending question. Some of them are *spurious* quotations, or quotations from spurious authorities, or rather both; and the remaining *few* assert that baptism is a saving ordinance, and that infant communion was as much commanded by God, and as certainly handed down from the apostles, as *infant baptism*. This was especially the case with Augustine. Indeed these two customs evidently arose together; they are sustained by the same historic evidence: they originated in the same error, (that baptism and communion are necessary to salvation,) and ought *to fall together*.

If Mr. F. wants proof of these facts, he can have an *ample supply*. If he wishes to hold on and continue writing, I will engage to find as good reasons and the same reasons, from scripture, (that is, none at all,) and from reason and common sense and from history, for infant *communion*, that he can for infant *baptism*. I might easily bring forward an army of Baptists, to prove that infant baptism was not practiced in the church until after the second century, to say the least. Yea, they might as roundly assert *this*, as Mr. F.'s witnesses do that it has always been practiced; or rather, as roundly as *he* asserts that they assert, for the *assertion* is principally his own, after all. I hope the reader will not be awed by the

number of Mr. F.'s witnesses, but examine them carefully, and let them pass for *all* that they are worth, and no more. He will recollect that the scriptures are entirely silent on the subject of infant baptism, and that historians say nothing about it for two centuries; that Tertullian is the first writer who mentions it, and that he wrote a book against it, as is generally supposed, in the beginning of the third century, A. D. 204. He can then examine the witnesses brought forward in these lectures, then notice my examination of them, and then observe the direct Pædobaptist testimony which I have presented to show that infant baptism was *not* practiced in the first two centuries: and also that it prevailed because it was thought to be essential to salvation, and then draw his own conclusions. For my own part, I cannot find an *inch* of solid ground, on which infant baptism 'can rest the sole of its foot.' I do not wish, however, to 'Lord it over another man's faith.' If the reader arrives at a different conclusion, I cannot help it; I only wish to do my duty, bear my humble, but plain and faithful testimony against what I deem to be error, and in favor of what I sincerely believe to be truth; and when I have thus done, I cheerfully leave the event with *him* 'who judgeth righteously.'

The reader knows what will be the sad result, should he build his religious practices on the sand, and not on 'solid rock.' And no one need mistake *sophistical quagmire* for solid ground, if he will but examine for himself. I have no idea that the humble, docile Christian, who prays to God for divine direction, with a desire to know the truth and tread the path of duty, will be left to wander into the mazes of doubt and error. But if we are too proud to ask God for direction, and wish to hold up ourselves in our early prejudices, we can *undoubtedly* and *easily* succeed. But I hope we shall remember, that if we are partial in our conclusions *now*, the hour cometh when partiality must be swept away, and TRUTH alone will shine forth after the day of trial in all her native loveliness and majesty. And I do hope

and pray that the reader will never turn away from this subject uttering the popular but *sinful* exclamation, 'O! it is not essential—what signifies so much talk about baptism?' But, reader, if it were only an item in the last will and testament of an honored father, would you speak thus? And shall the *living counsel* and the *dying direction* of JESUS be treated as a matter of little or no consequence? 'God forbid.'

CHAPTER VII.

SCRIPTURAL VIEW OF BAPTISM.

WE have examined *Greek classic usage*. The '*usus loquendi*' determines that baptizo means to dip, to immerse—not to sprinkle or to pour. From this decision there is no appeal. We have consulted lexicographers and critics. They uniformly give immersion as the *primary* and prevailing signification of baptizo. And as it is a law adopted by all correct interpreters and fair reasoners, that the primary and prevailing signification shall be considered the true one, unless something in the nature of the subject demands a secondary meaning, and as nothing in the nature and design of baptism requires any other than the primary definition, on the principles of fair interpretation and manly argument, we are led by lexicographers and critics to the same conclusion; that baptism is immersion and not affusion. An appeal to ecclesiastical history has shown clearly, that the Christian church, for several centuries subsequent to the apostolic age, understood baptizo as meaning to dip, to plunge; and that immersion was the common practice of Christians for, at least, thirteen hundred years. Thus, *classic usage*, lexicographers and critics, and ecclesiastical historians concur, to prove that this Greek word means to *dip* and not to *affuse*. We are now prepared to take up the book of God, and inquire whether there is any thing in the Bible which should lead us to adopt a *new* definition of this word; or whether the sacred writers use it in such a manner as to confirm us in our belief, that in the inspired Scriptures it means to immerse, to dip. May the Lord help us to approach his word with reverence and docility—thirsting for truth and desiring to ascertain the plain, obvious import of Scripture passages, instead of laboring to press them into the service of denominational opinion. Mr. Fowler's arguments may be arranged and examined in the following order: 1. The design of baptism. 2. John's ministry and baptism. 3. Christ's baptism—an induction into the office of priest. 4.

Greek prepositions. 5. Attending circumstances of baptism. 6. Allusions to baptism.

1. *The design of baptism.*—Mr. F. inquires, page 15, ‘What, then, is the design of baptism? What does this rite signify? I answer purification; and this is the only scriptural and consistent answer that can be given. More fully, *it is the design of baptism to represent the purification of the soul and an engrafting into Christ by the Holy Ghost*: and the visitation of the Holy Ghost, for the performance of this work, is always represented in the Bible by language which denotes affusion—never by language which denotes immersion. As water baptism is a symbol of spiritual baptism,’ &c. This looks pretty smooth.—This language is very positive. It is Mr. Fowler’s *opinion*. We will candidly inspect and analyze it. Baptism is designed, according to the *above* declaration, to represent *three things*. 1. The purification of the soul. 2. Our engrafting into Christ. 3. Spiritual baptism. Now I *believe* that this is not correct. For this view of the subject involves contradiction and impracticability. This, if true, is enough to condemn it forever. And it is true—for, 1st, It is impossible that baptism should represent baptism, and at the same time represent *engrafting* and *purification*. This, I think, must be self-evident.

2nd. While it cannot possibly represent *all these*, it is impracticable to make baptism represent *either* of the *three* when considered *alone*. Take spiritual baptism, by which I suppose he means the baptism of the Holy Ghost.—Water baptism cannot be designed to represent this; because there is *now*, no such thing in existence. As well might it be said that water baptism represented the baptism of the Israelites unto Moses, in the cloud and in the sea, because they were said, in a *figurative* sense, to be baptized. The baptism of the Holy Ghost was confined to the apostolic age. It was called baptism, not on account of the manner in which it was received, but on account of its effects after it *was received*. The apostles were, on the day of Pentecost, overwhelmed with the Spirit’s influences like an object soaked in a fluid. They were literally immersed in the well known symbol of the

spirit, viz. *wind*. See John iii : 8. Fire, the emblem of the gift of tongues, and in the *shape of cloven tongues*, sat upon them. Those who were thus baptized spake with new tongues and wrought miracles. How evident that Christians are not now baptized in the Holy Ghost ! And yet I sometimes hear people pray that they may be baptized in the Holy Ghost. Such are, undoubtedly, honest in their petitions. But they ask they know not what. As well might they ask God to feed them, literally, with manna from heaven ! He was pleased to feed Israel with manna, and he baptized the apostles and primitive Christians in the Holy Ghost ; but he will do neither for us. Both were done by him for special reasons, which do not now exist, and for the accomplishment of purposes which are not *now* necessary. Does any man claim that he is now fed with manna like the Israelites, or baptized in the Holy Ghost like the apostles ? Let him give us the same proof of the facts, which the Israelites and apostles gave. *Then*, and not *till then*, will I believe him. Besides, there are objections to this theory which I shall notice in another place.

The grand difficulty is, our author (with many others) has blended together two things which ought to be kept distinct, viz. the *miraculous gifts* of the Spirit, which were peculiar to the apostolic age, and the *renewing influences* of the Spirit, which are common to all Christians. Water baptism cannot properly represent this baptism of the Holy Ghost therefore ; because it cannot be designed to represent a thing which does not exist. And here arises another difficulty. If baptism represents spiritual baptism, why does Mr. F. apply this rite to unconscious children, which have not been spiritually baptized ? But he has, with great confidence, referred to this text as affording conclusive evidence that Christians are *now* baptized in the Holy Ghost, as were the apostles. ‘For by one spirit are we all baptized into one body, and have all been made to drink into one spirit.’ 1 Cor. xii. 13. I am sorry he did not critically examine his text before he quoted it for this purpose. Had he only distinguished between the object into *which*, and the Agent by *whom*, all Christians are

baptized, he would have left out that text from his list of citations. In this inspired language we are taught that all Christians are baptized—into what? one body. What body? The mystical body of Christ. By whom, or by what agent is this done? By the Holy Ghost. ‘*By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body.*’ All this is perfectly plain to those who think for themselves, instead of relying on the authority of great names. It is as plain as this statement: ‘Many, confessing their sins, were by one John baptized *into one Jordan.*’ What would be thought of him, if he should catch the above sentence and insist upon it, and quote it repeatedly, to prove that these Jews were baptized in John! This is precisely the ground of his argument, or rather his *sophism*, from the text, 1 Cor. xii: 13. I hope he will hereafter notice the difference between the *agent* by *whom*, and the *element*, or *object*, or *body*, *into* which we are baptized. If he can discover this very *obvious* distinction, it will save him and others some needless labor. And, finally, is it possible that all Christians are sprinkled or poured into the body of Christ? I think it sounds much better, and makes much better sense and better theology, to say, we are *baptized*, that is, immersed into the body of Christ.

2. Baptism cannot possibly represent the act of engrafting into Christ. Neither pouring, nor sprinkling, nor wetting, nor washing, nor immersing, can represent engrafting. This cannot, therefore, be the design of baptism. For the design of this rite does not involve an impossibility. Does Mr. F. adhere to his notion? Then I insist upon it he shall show us *how* water baptism in any form represents engrafting! Observe, I am not opposing the idea that Christians are engrafted into Christ. No, this is a glorious truth. But I oppose the idea that baptism is designed to represent this engrafting; because it is not scriptural, and because it involves gross absurdity and utter impossibility. Christ is a *rock*; but it is not true that as a rock he represents the Good Shepherd of Israel, gathering the lambs in his arms and carrying them in his bosom. The rock gather the lambs in his arms! Baptism represent engrafting! Mr. F. is a man of too much

sense, and too good a linguist, to be pleased with this solecism in language and absurdity in thought, after a careful review of this subject. Besides, if this were the design of baptism, the question arises again, why does he baptize infants who have never been engrafted into Christ, but who, as he says, and as the Bible says, are ‘by nature children of wrath’? But he has not quoted a text of scripture to prove this point, and as it involves contradiction and impracticability, we let it pass, and come to the third thing which is represented, as he says, by baptism.

On this part of the subject he has labored assiduously, and, no doubt, he supposed, successfully. This *part* of the design he has attempted to support by quotations from scripture. It may seem a little ungenerous to pull down the fair edifice which he has erected with so much toil, and which appears so beautiful to him, and which he is sure is based on ‘solid rock’. But, really, I am not pleased with his fine superstructure. I think a critical examination will show that the ‘solid rock’ on which it rests, is nothing but a *sand-bank*, after all. Let us proceed gently, and try the strength of the foundation on which this theory is based.

1. I admit that the idea of cleansing is connected with baptism—but that it is not the leading design of baptism I shall endeavor to show, when I take the affirmative of this impending question.

2. It is not possible that the purification of the soul by the operation of the Holy Spirit is represented by baptism—but this is the argument. He goes on (see 15th page) to show what the mode is in which the Spirit descends upon the heart. The Spirit was poured out—therefore, water baptism must represent this, and, of course, the water must be poured. Now to the superficial observer this really looks fair and substantial—but it has no more a solid foundation on truth or correct criticism, than have the fantastic speculations of Swedenborg! And yet nothing which has ever been said by Pædobaptists has been considered more specious. The argument is thought by Mr. F. and others, to be *unanswerable*. I will try for once to answer an unanswerable argument.

1. This whole theory arises from gross misconceptions of the nature of the Holy Ghost, and the misapplication of figurative language. The theory supposes that God is *material*; that his Spirit can be *literally* poured or sprinkled on man; and, therefore, water baptism must represent this! This is converting the glorious Godhead into matter.

2. Here is a manifest abuse of figurative language. True, the Bible says that the Spirit is poured out; and the Bible says that God's 'hand is lifted up', 'stretched forth',—that 'his eye-lids try the children of men,'—that 'his ear is open to the cry of the righteous'. But these are all figures of speech. They are beautiful and impressive, and no one need mistake their import. But can it be possible that Mr. F. will take these passages literally, and attempt to represent these things by *any thing* in the wide dominions of nature? Shall symbols themselves be symbolized? Will he attempt to represent God as stretching forth his arm? Will he attempt to represent the Eternal God, as walking and speaking and hearing and rising, and then tell us the *mode* in which God speaks and hears and walks and rises—and, to crown the whole, undertake to symbolize or represent these modes by water baptism, or by any thing in nature? Absurd, not to say unhallowed attempt. Yet this is the very principle adopted in his reasoning on baptism. He cannot say that water baptism represents the mode of the Spirit's operation on the soul, without implying that God is material, and is literally poured out like water—that he understands the mode of the Spirit's operation, and can represent that mode of the Spirit by *mode* in water baptism. Now all this is false. God is not material. Mr. F. does not know the *mode* of the Spirit's operations, unless he is wiser than Gabriel—for, from the nature of the subject, it is beyond the feeble grasp of finite minds. Nor can he possibly represent the mode of the operations of Spirit on spirit by water baptism, any more than he can by rubbing a piece of chalk and charcoal together. As well might he by a wreath of smoke unite a sunbeam and an earthclod. The subject is too high for him—such a

work is beyond his reach. But suppose for one moment that this were the design of baptism. Then insuperable objections arise. These representations of the Spirit's operation, which are in themselves symbolical, are numerous and variegated. On this plan he would soon have fifty modes of baptism, without the aid of Latin dictionaries and denominational critics. The plan will lead him to proceed thus:—The Spirit is poured out—therefore the candidate must be poured. (This is murdering the English language, but let that go.) Here he stops to send forth the shout of victory. But why stop here? Let us have more of the beauties of this plan. We will move along a little further. The Spirit descends like the dew—therefore the candidate must be bedewed. Two modes. 3. The Spirit is like a river that makes glad the city of God in its 'peaceful flow'—therefore baptism must represent a flowing river. Three modes. *Query*.—How can this be done? 4. The Spirit is like a well, from which we draw the waters of salvation—hence *drawing* is baptism! the water comes by *drawing*. Four modes. 5. The Spirit is in the Christian a well of water springing up into life—hence baptism is *springing* up. Five modes. 6. The Spirit operates like a blowing wind, hence baptism must represent this; and *baptism* is *blowing*. Six modes. 7. The Spirit is like a refiner's fire. This too must be represented by water baptism. I cannot imagine how this is to be done, but it must be done, for Mr. F. has 'no sympathy for a system, the support of which requires the rejection of *any part* of the Bible.' If he undertakes to represent the modes of the Spirit's operation, he must not be partial and take one text which treats on this subject, and exclude others which are entitled to equal notice. Seven modes. How can he possibly make baptism represent all these and many other things? If there be any force in truth, and any truth in axioms, is it not evident that this whole theory is a tissue of contradictions and absurdities? But still some will cling, perhaps, to this 'unanswerable argument:' 'The apostles were baptized on the day of Pentecost; on that day the Holy Spirit was *poured out*. This baptism was certainly performed by pouring,

therefore baptism is pouring.' Now have I not stated the argument of my opponents as fairly as they can do it themselves? This, I confess, at first glance, looks plausible. It appears like a fair system; but the argument is 'part of iron and part of clay,' and they are not bound together by a single muscle. All its speciousness arises from the blending together of two things which are distinct, viz. the *pouring out* of the Spirit, and the *baptism*. There is no more connection between them than there is between the filling of a bath and the baptism of a candidate in the bath. And it would be quite as good logic to say, that baptism in this case was filling, because the bath was filled; or, baptism is drawing, because the water was drawn; as to say, that baptism in the Spirit is pouring, because the Spirit came by pouring, or was poured out. The baptism regards the influences of the Spirit when come, and not to the manner or mode of its *coming*. The earth is moistened and fertilized by water, and this water comes by raining; but will any good philologist say, that *moistening* is *raining*? None but a superficial critic will rush to this conclusion. For if moistening is raining, then the earth would be moistened every time it rained; although the rain fell upon the mountains of the moon, and not on the thirsty hills of our planet. Again, if raining is moistening, then every time it rains on the ocean, the sea is moistened. Again, we are told, Acts x. that 'the Holy Ghost *fell* on them that heard the word.' Here the Spirit came by *falling*. On this plan baptism is *falling*. The Spirit falls on men. 'This none can deny.' Again, 'God pours his curses on the wicked.' Will Mr. F. say that the mode of the sinner's punishment 'is by pouring, and not by immersion'? Therefore the punishment of the wicked is *pouring*. God drowned the old world. He poured out the water from the bottles of heaven—from the reservoirs above and below the firmament. The world was *drowned* by *pouring*, therefore drowning is pouring. Though Tertullian, whom Mr. F. has brought forward to prove *sprinkling*, called the flood the *baptism* of the world. According to this, God drowned the world by *sprinkling*! Now who, that is endowed with good sense

and will use it, can fail to discover the false criticism on which this whole theory rests? Mr. F. reminds me of the fable in which the Indians placed the world on the back of a great tortoise, but forgot to prepare a standing place 'for the poor tortoise while bearing her ponderous load.' But has he not quoted passages of Scripture to prove his doctrine? O yes, and so does the Pope, to prove *transubstantiation*.

1st. His passages do not reach the case. He has quoted but one single text which even *names* baptism. That *one text* does not belong to him as a Pædobaptist. This I will show in place. He must produce proof texts which at least name the rite of baptism, or evidently involve it, or they will not be admitted. He has no right to select passages of Scripture and say these mean baptism, when they *say* nothing about it. Nor has he any right when I produce proof texts which speak of baptism, to say that baptism *is not intended*: both of which he has done. See pp. 15 and 115. The passages, 'Born of water and of the Spirit,' 'Washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost,' &c., do not mean baptism. I might show the absurdity of this application of these precious texts, but I have not time, and it is not necessary, because they do not even *mention baptism*. If Mr. F. were laboring to show the design of circumcision, and should quote this passage, 'Noah, moved with fear, prepared an ark,' I would not reject the passage as obsolete; but I should be under no obligation to examine and explain the passage as a proof text in the case. I would say, give us a text which *mentions circumcision*: so I say concerning baptism. Among many objections which I have to his *application* of these passages, I will name two. 1st. It leads irresistibly to the conclusion that baptism is a saving ordinance. On this plan, baptism is the washing of regeneration.—Without it, none can be saved. Except a man be baptized (born of water) he cannot be saved. The case is clear—the declaration of Christ is unequivocal, if this means baptism. If it does not mean baptism, then nothing about the design of that ordinance can be learned from

them. I leave the author to take his choice in the horns of the dilemma; neither will aid his cause.

2d. If this *does* mean baptism, how, I ask, can a man be *born of*, or *born in*, or *born by*, sprinkling or pouring? Can a man enter into a drop of water and be born? I do not in all things acknowledge Mr. F. as my Rabbi, but I should be glad to have him teach me a little on this subject, either by night or by day. I hope he will not with an air of dignified importance call this '*ridicule* and vulgarity.' He has quoted the text as though it meant water baptism. If so, the question how can a man be born of *sprinkling*? is a fair question; and I assure him that some of his readers are 'calling for light' on this subject, over which "darkness and perversion have so long reigned." Ignorant African Bishops in the third century, were the first to make this application of these precious texts of scripture. And from the belief that *baptism* was meant, and that it saved the soul, the practice of infant baptism arose. Ever since that period, in the minds of some, "darkness and perversion" have reigned over this subject. In fact, it is *only* by an appeal to African bishops, the adoption of their laws of scripture interpretation, and the imitation of their practices, that the general theory contained in these lectures, can be supported. And if the theory were universally adopted and carried out into practice, in one half century the church would be involved in darkness as gross as that in which she was enshrouded previous to the reformation by Luther and Calvin. Mr. F. brings forward his rocky question again, but I rejoice that prudence has dictated a little alteration in the phraseology. He has concluded not to contradict expressly the testimony of the Holy Spirit concerning Christ's baptism, but says now, that 'Christ *after* his crucifixion was buried in a rock, not in the water.' But who ever claimed that Christ after his crucifixion, was buried in the water? ('Ingenuity has many shifts.') But the question itself: 'If the design of baptism be so symbolize the burial and resurrection of Christ, why not put the candidate into a rock? This question I have answered in my Address;

see p. 39, and onward. I will just remark in this place, that the question proceeds on a false principle. It supposes that *symbolical* and *tragical* representation are the same. This is false. It is not necessary, in order to symbolize the burial and resurrection of Christ, that we should resort to tragedy. It is admitted that the supper is designed to represent the *death* of Christ. I may with as much propriety enquire, why not mould the bread used in the Lord's supper into the shape of a man, and nail it to a cross, and then pierce it with a soldier's spear? This was the way in which Christ died on the cross, and not on a communion plate? He was taken *down* from the cross, and not taken *up* from a communion plate. Every one can see that this is an absurd question. Equally absurd is the other. Both proceed on false principles. If, however, Mr. F. insists upon it, he can excavate a hole in some rock, and baptize his candidate by placing him in it. But I hope he will not claim superior wisdom nor Bible authority in the affair. The Baptists will probably continue to obey God, and bury their candidates in the water, and not in the rock.

Mr. F. in his appendix B., has referred to six men as authorities to prove that the texts in Rom. vi: 4, I. Cor. xv: 29, do not sustain the position that it is the design of baptism to symbolize the resurrection of Christ. I will only say that I can easily produce a far greater number, and Pædobaptists too, that are of a contrary opinion, if he or the public shall see fit to call for them. Indeed it was the *common opinion*, for several hundred years after Christ, that baptism was designed to represent the burial and resurrection of Christ, and the believer's death to sin and resurrection to newness of life. This is plain as demonstration from the writings of the fathers. See Stuart, p. 358, and *all* the fathers. And yet Mr. F. unkindly insinuates that the advocates of immersion have fallen into a *palpable mistake* on this subject, for "the want of sound arguments upon which to rest their exclusive views." And in a note at the bottom he incorrectly asserts, that "nearly the whole Protestant world corres-

pond with these (his own) views.” Every man of extensive Theological reading knows this is not correct. But it is not the *opinion* of this church nor that—of Pædobaptists nor Baptists, but the doctrine of the Holy Ghost on this subject, that we should seek, and believe and value. Having ‘removed the rubbish,’ we will now build the wall.

The design of baptism, is to represent the burial and resurrection of Christ—‘The death and resurrection of Christ are the first two foundation principles of the Gospel. Thus saith the Apostle, 1 Cor. xv : 1, 4. ‘For I delivered unto you first of all, that which I also received; how that Christ *died* for our sins and that he was *buried* and that he *rose again* the third day, according to the scriptures.’ These three *grand* events, the *death, burial* and *resurrection* of our Saviour, are often introduced in the New Testament, as subjects of vast importance. They are not only important as articles in our *faith*, but essential as the basis of our hope. Ask the *humble*, intelligent Christian, why do you hope for heaven? He will reply. Jesus died for our offences, and was raised for our justification.

These *primary essential* truths need to be often presented to our minds. God has therefore appointed in his church, two ordinances which are specifically designed to *present* and illustrate these great leading truths of Christianity.—They are baptism and the Lord’s Supper. It is conceded on all hands that the *object* of the Supper is to show forth the Lord’s *death*, till he come. We learn from the same inspired Apostle, that the design of baptism is to represent in symbol equally solemn and impressive, the burial and resurrection of the Lord Jesus. Thus in Rom. vi : 4, after having shown that salvation is by grace, *abounding grace*, the Apostle anticipated an objection. ‘If when sin abound, grace did much more abound, let us *sin* that grace may *still* abound.’ Nay says Paul, with feelings of abhorrence, and in the language of holy indignation, ‘*God forbid.*’ He then refers them to their own solemn *profession*, in which they submitted to the sacred and significant ordinance of baptism. He then labors to shew them or rather to remind them, that the *obvious* and

practical design of that Gospel rite, was to inspire *their* hearts with the same sentiments which warmed *his* bosom, and guided his pen while writing on this subject. And here I can but admire the goodness of God. Many honest Christians are not able to read the Greek Testament, nor search lexicons, and classic Greek writers to ascertain for themselves the meaning of baptizo. But *He* has rendered the meaning of the word perfectly plain and its design obvious, to all who can read the Bible, without the aid of learned critics and expositors. And while learned men in their disputes about the meaning of the original word, give more evidence of prejudice and sophistry, than they do of intelligence and candor, the honest disciple of Jesus may open his Bible, and learn from the comment of the Holy Spirit; the design of this blessed ordinance, and the manner in which it *should* be performed; God be praised that it is so. Would you be taught by the Spirit, on whose instructions you may safely rely? Then turn to Rom. vi : 3. 4, ' Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized unto Jesus Christ, were baptized into his death? That is *emblematically* we were baptized into his death. Just as in the supper we eat his flesh and drink the blood of Christ, that is in *symbol*. In both we shew our union *to* Christ, and our interest *in* his death, burial and resurrection.' ' Therefore we are *buried with* him (symbolically) *by baptism* into death : that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.' How can language more plainly describe the *practical* use and specific design of baptism? can there be any doubt in the mind of a reasonable, unprejudiced man, with regard to the import of the word baptism? Can there be any doubt concerning the way to be *buried* by baptism, or *buried in* baptism? Is there more than one mode in which we can if we *try*, *bury* a man by baptism? It really seems to me *not*. Here the word of God, declares in unequivocal language, ' that by *baptism* we are *buried*. Compared with this *one* inspired text which speaks in language that a child may understand, do not the elaborate and far fetched arguments or *sophisms* of

the author, appear like the “Magicians’ rods before the rod of Moses?” And in regard to the *scriptural* view of the subject, is not my reader ready to exclaim ‘*This is the finger of God!*’ How is it possible for a man to be *buried* by sprinkling? or in pouring? Unless we pour or sprinkle long enough and ‘largely’ enough to cover him up completely, he is not buried. But the author says that this text has nothing to do with the *mode* of baptism. And it is often said that all Christians have been buried by baptism, in the sense of the passage. Then if this mean spiritual baptism, I would ask why not bury the candidate in water? For Mr. F. says that ‘water baptism is a symbol of spiritual baptism.’ If the *one* is a burial, the other should be also.’

But the statement is not correct. All Christians are interested in the death and resurrection of Christ; but it is not true that all Christians have *been buried by baptism* into his death! Those Christians who were never baptized *at all* have never been buried *by baptism* of course. If Mr. F. catches hold of his text in 1 Cor. xii:13, and says, ‘We have been all baptized into one body by the Spirit,’ it does not help his cause in the least, for in this case they were not *poured* nor *sprinkled*, but *immersed* unto Christ. And he says that the *one* is a symbol of the other baptism, see p. 15. And those who have been sprinkled have *not been buried* by baptism, surely. The author and those men to whom he refers, and whose testimony with that of several churches on page eighteen he thinks places his position on solid rock, must have overlooked the *fact*, that the apostle not only says we are buried and raised up—but also that we are buried *by* or *in* baptism. This *fact* demolishes his whole theory at a single stroke. There can be no use in denying a fact so plain and simple. I would not ‘smite God’s high priest;’ but I may tell him that the authority of his great names is nothing when arrayed against Paul; and especially while ten times their number of Pædobaptists dissent from them, whose opinions would be as much entitled to respect as their own!

But let us look into the text once more for ourselves, and not depend on great men, whose opinions clash with each other.

“Buried with him by baptism.” “This language is figurative. We are covered up in a grave, or laid in a tomb, or buried with Christ. How? By baptism, the apostle adds; and this addition modifies the figure and makes the sense as clear as it is possible for express words to make it. *In or by baptism*, Paul and the Christians whom he addresses, were buried. To be crucified to the world or dead to sin, is the character of Christians; but to be *buried* with Christ by baptism, is the appointed emblematical *profession* of that character. To have such a state of mind, to be dead to sin, is one thing: to be buried with Christ *by baptism*, is quite another thing; for this is external, whereas the other is internal. The one is a sign, the other the thing signified. It is only by confounding what the apostle has kept distinct, that there can be any mistake concerning this passage. We are never said to be buried in circumcision or in crucifixion, or risen therein to newness of life.” This would be using language without meaning, and this the inspired writers never do. Such language would be absurd, because there is nothing like a burial in circumcision, or crucifixion, or sprinkling. And if baptism consisted in affusion, I am certain we never should have read in God’s word about being *buried* in baptism. There is no kind of resemblance between an affusion of water and a burial and resurrection. But every man of candor and common sense will admit that there is a resemblance between immersion and a burial, emersion and a resurrection. And since the expression *buried in baptism* is sanctioned by divine inspiration, we have incontestable proof that baptism is not affusion, but *immersion*. Surely the ‘advocates of affusion’ will not contend that the word *buried*, here used by the Holy Spirit to explain the design of baptism has ‘fifty meanings;’ lest the public should justly infer that ‘much learning hath made them mad.’ Says Mr. Carson, “In our baptism, then, (referring to Rom. vi: 4,) we are emblematically laid in the grave with Christ, and we also emblematically rise with him. What

simplicity, what beauty, what edification are contained in this ordinance! How have all these been overwhelmed by the traditions of men! How clearly does this ordinance present the truth which saves the soul! How admirably is it calculated to recall the mind to a view of the ground of hope that is calculated to silence unbelief. How is it that a vile sinner can escape the wrath of God and obtain eternal life? How is it that Christ's work is available for him? Why, when Christ paid our debt, we ourselves paid our debt, for we are one with him. We have died with Christ and have risen with Christ. Christ's death is our death, Christ's burial is our burial, Christ's resurrection is our resurrection. How *solemn* and interesting and impressive is that ordinance which represents all this! Can anything but immersion be baptism?" Thus the Bible itself defines baptism, and shows its design and practical use. No definition can be better; no language can be plainer.

Again, to the same purpose is 1st Cor. xv: 29.—'Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? Why are they then baptized for the dead?' The Apostle was discussing the doctrine of the resurrection. He begins with the resurrection of Christ. 1. He proves that Christ had risen. 2. He shows what would be the sad consequences if this fundamental article in the Christian's faith were not true. As first, the faith of the Corinthian disciples was vain, and they were yet in their sins. Second, the Apostles were false witnesses—for they declared 'first of all' that Christ died, was buried, and rose again. Third, their religious practices were absurd—especially their baptism was an unmeaning ceremony, because they had been *buried by baptism* into the likeness of Christ's death, and raised up with him to walk in newness of life. There was, therefore, an *inconsistency* in their baptism, unless Christ had risen from the dead. And now on this supposition that Christ has not risen, there is no resurrection. But now is Christ risen. Else, (if this doctrine be not true,) what shall they do which are or have been baptized for the dead? What propriety, what *use* is there in baptism? Why

solemnize an ordinance which symbolizes so plainly a burial and a resurrection?—an ordinance which exhibits the belief that Christ died, was buried, and rose again, if you do not after all believe in these fundamental truths of Christianity? This is the plain, obvious meaning of the passage. Mr. F. says that this text is confessed by all expositors to be obscure and of difficult interpretation. But it is not correct that *all* commentators consider this passage obscure. To some it is clear as the light of heaven. That it is difficult for *sprinklers* to interpret the passage, I readily admit. This Mr. F. has proved to a demonstration. He does not pretend to give any exposition of the text, but in his appendix he has given us the opinion of two of his own number, Macknight and Doddridge, both valuable men—both opinions good, *he* thinks; but the misery is, they contradict each other; or they do not harmonize; they cannot both be right—they *may* both be wrong. Paul was inspired—and to those who read and think for themselves, his language is plain, and his argument clear as the crystal stream. If the passage is obscure, it is because a cloud of Pædobaptist fog has been raised around the subject. Whatever view we take of this passage, one thing is evident. There was in the mind of Paul a manifest connexion between baptism and the resurrection of the dead—this is enough to sustain the argument.

As Mr. F. refers to Macknight to disprove my views of the *design* of baptism, I wish to present the reader with a note of this author. He says on Romans vi: 4—
 ‘Buried together with him by baptism. Christ’s baptism was not the baptism of repentance, for he never committed any sin; but he submitted to be baptized—that is, *to be buried under the water* by John, and *to be raised out of it again*—as an emblem of his future *death and resurrection*. In like manner the baptism of believers is emblematical of their own death, burial and resurrection. See Col. ii: 12. Perhaps, also, it is a commemoration of Christ’s baptism.’ This is the testimony of a justly celebrated Pædobaptist divine, and, in general, critical expositor, who has been brought forward by Mr. F. to sup-

port his views of baptism!! No comment from my pen is demanded in this place.

See also Col. ii : 12. ‘Buried with him *in baptism*, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead.’ How could language more lucidly exhibit the import and express the design of baptism? Do not these passages amply sustain my position, that baptism represents the burial and resurrection of Christ?

Once more, 1st Peter iii : 21. ‘The like figure whereunto baptism doth now save us—(not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God)—by the resurrection of Jesus Christ.’ Mr. F. and Adam Clarke talk about the waters of baptism ‘typifying the regenerating influences of the Holy Spirit.’ But this is a figment of their own imaginations. The Apostle neither says nor intimates any such thing. He had just spoken of the Saviour as put to death in the flesh, and quickened or raised up to life by the Spirit. Then glancing at the waters of the flood and the preservation of Noah, he says, the like figure—that is, in a manner somewhat similar—‘baptism doth now save us, *by the resurrection* of Jesus Christ.’ If there is any meaning in language, the Apostle shows clearly that the ordinance of baptism is designed especially to recognize the death and resurrection of Christ. As faith saves us, not by its own intrinsic virtue, but by fixing on Christ as its object,—so baptism saves us, not in itself, but by pointing to the resurrection of the Son of God as the cause of our salvation.

If these several texts do not prove that the design of baptism is to exhibit our faith in the resurrection of Christ, and our death to sin and resurrection to newness of life, then there is no point in theology which can be proved by the inspired word of God. And when baptism is administered to unconscious children, or to any but apparent believers in Christ—or when sprinkling is substituted for baptism, the significancy is gone—the design is lost—‘the glory is departed.’ Now supposing that the idea of cleansing enters into the ordinance ; (we admit it does) :

it is *not* the great object of baptism to ‘represent purification.’ Mr. F. asserts it roundly—but assertion is not proof.

How can Christians be willing to rob themselves of the design of baptism and divest the institution of its glory? If it were the exclusive design of baptism to represent purification, does not immersion signify this as fully as affusion? And is it not important to be often reminded of the grand medium *through* which as well as the means *by* which we are cleansed from sin? The redeemed in heaven not only rejoice that they are saved, but that they are saved through the sufferings and death of Christ. ‘Worthy the Lamb that died, they cry.’ Those who practice immersion, retain the primary and the whole design of baptism. They not only embrace the idea that we are purified from sin by the Holy Spirit, but they regard sacredly the leading design of the institution, which is to hold up the burial and the resurrection of Christ, through whom all these blessings of ‘purification’ and eternal life do flow. It does appear to me that Pædobaptists must see the propriety and feel the force of this statement.

He says *analogy* favors his view of the subject. But analogy has nothing to do in pointing out the design of this ordinance. When its design is announced in the scriptures, it is the province of analogy to trace the resemblance between the symbol or sign and the thing symbolized. And hence analogy, as well as the design of the institution, and history, and lexicographers and critics, and the *usus loquendi*, all declare that baptism is immersion and not aspersion.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE BAPTISM OF JOHN.

ON opening the New Testament, the first thing on this subject that meets our view, is the commission, preaching and baptism of John. Every thing in the account of the first administration of this ordinance favors the idea of immersion and not of affusion. John baptized a host of candidates, who confessed their sins, *in the river of Jordan*. No man, till he gives up his common sense, can suppose that John went into the river of Jordan with his candidates in order to sprinkle them, unless he believes that the harbinger of our Lord was a lunatic.

But Mr. F. has declared that ‘John’s baptism was not Christian baptism.’—*See page 37*. He has given nine reasons why it was not Christian baptism.

1. ‘It was not instituted by Christ.’ *Ans.*—There was a man sent by *God* to preach and baptize. As Mr. F. is a sound and strenuous advocate of the essential deity of Christ, will he explain to us how John could be sent of *God* and yet Christ have nothing to do with the commission? Again, our Lord Jesus at a certain period made and baptized more disciples than John, that is, he *directed* his disciples in the case.—*See John iv : 1, 2*. Will he say that baptism performed under the immediate and personal direction of Christ is not Christian baptism? If he does, will honest, intelligent people believe him?

2. ‘He did not baptize in the name of the Father, Son and Holy Ghost.’ How does Mr. F. know what words John used when he baptized? I believe the Bible does not tell: unless in Acts xix, where Paul, (as many judicious expositors believe) in describing the nature and design of John’s ministry, declares that he baptized in the *name of the Lord*. This is the phraseology employed by Peter in Acts x: ‘He commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord.’ Does it not amount to the same thing, whether we baptize, or preach, or pray in the

name of the Lord, or in the name of the ‘sacred three?’
 ‘For these three are one.’

3. ‘Some whom he baptized afterwards received Christian baptism.’—*See Acts xix.* This is not certain. Calvin, Poole, Robins, and a host of Pædobaptists, *deny* that they were re-baptized. Again, if they were, it does not show that John’s baptism was *anti-christian*, but only that they did not receive it understandingly. And if they were re-baptized, I hope that when we give Christian baptism to those who have been before refused, (as we have done in some instances) Mr. F. will not murmur.

4 and 6. ‘John and Christ declare that the gospel dispensation was near, but had not fully come.’ This is his assertion without proof. Neither Christ nor John used this language.

5. ‘John observed the *ordinances* of the Jewish dispensation.’ The Bible says he was in the *deserts* from his childhood until the day of his shewing unto Israel.—Instead of attending Jewish festivals and eating unleavened bread, was he not in the wilderness, living on locusts and wild honey? Instead of the sacerdotal robe, was he not clothed in raiment of camels’ hair? Instead of entering into the temple to offer sacrifice and burn incense, did he not say, when he began to preach to the people, that they should believe on him that was to come, until Christ stood before him? Then pointing to a nobler sacrifice than was ever laid on Jewish altars, he cried, Behold the Lamb of God! If Mr. F. has had a new revelation from heaven of late, I wish him to tell what ‘ordinances of the Jewish dispensation’ John observed. How easy it is to make reckless assertions; but this is not always the surest way to secure public confidence.

7. ‘Nothing but the death of Christ could set aside the old dispensation and introduce the new; of course, Christian baptism could not be introduced till after the crucifixion.’ Then the Lord’s Supper is not a *Christian* ordinance; for that was instituted before Christ’s death.—What does he mean, when he talks about *Christian* communion? Christ’s ministry was not, for the same reason,

the Christian ministry ! Those who preached by his authority and direction were not Christian ministers ! And the Christian church could not have been organized.

8. 'Christian baptism was instituted by Christ after his resurrection.' Gospel baptism was instituted when John was commissioned by the God of heaven to go and preach and baptize. Christ honored the sacred rite by a personal submission to it in the river of Jordan, and afterwards encouraged its administration by his personal authority, and included it (not instituted it) in his valedictory *commission*.

But let us leave this *quibble* about *Christian* baptism and Mr. F.'s *ipse dixit* in the case, and inquire what saith the Scripture concerning the ministry of John the Baptist.

Mark i : 1. 'The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. 2. As it is written in the prophets, Behold, I send my messenger before my face, which shall prepare thy way before thee. 3. The voice of one crying in the wilderness, prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight. 4. John did baptize in the wilderness,' &c. The kingdom of heaven, or the gospel dispensation, did not commence till after Christ's resurrection, says Mr. Fowler. But I learn from Matt. xi : 12, 13, that '*From* the days of John the Baptist until now (when Christ was teaching before his death) the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence and the violent take it by force.' Mr. F. says, that Christian baptism was not instituted until after Christ's resurrection. John says, c. iii : 22, 24, 'After these things came Jesus and his disciples into the land of Judea, and there he tarried with them and baptized.' Again, John iv : 1, 2, 'When therefore the Lord knew how the Pharisees had heard that Jesus made and baptized more disciples than John ; (2. Though Jesus himself baptized not but his disciples.)' Which will the reader believe, Mr. Fowler or the Bible ? Or will he say that baptism, administered by the direct authority and under the immediate notice of Christ, is not Christian baptism ? All this was done, it will be recollected, be-

fore John *was* cast into prison. See John iii : 24. The new dispensation dawned upon the world in the ministry of John the Baptist. See Luke i : 77, 78. And Mr. Scott says, on Mark i : 1. ‘This was, *in fact*, the beginning of the gospel—the introduction to the new dispensation.’ Matthew Henry says, in his exposition on Mark i : ‘The gospel began in John the Baptist, for the law and the prophets were until John ; but *then*, the kingdom of God began to be preached. Peter begins from the baptism of John, Acts i : 22.’ ‘In John’s preaching and baptizing, there was the beginning of the gospel doctrines and *ordinances*,’ &c. ‘In the success of John’s preaching and the *disciples*, he *admitted*, by *baptism*, there was the beginning of the *gospel church*.’ See Henry, (*in loco*.)

Thus it appears that the author of these lectures does not agree with Pædobaptist expositors on this subject. There was, undoubtedly, some incidental difference between the gospel ministry and gospel baptism before the death of Christ, and after that event—but they were *substantially* the same in both cases. The baptism which was administered before the death of Christ and the baptism which was administered afterward, was the same with regard to the subject and the mode. In both cases *immersion* was *baptism*, and penitent believers were the candidates. John directed them to believe on Christ as yet to come, until he stood before him, and then he cried, ‘behold ! the Lamb.’ The Apostles required their hearers to believe in a *risen* and ascended Saviour. The *faith* of the candidates was in essence the same ; and when fruits of faith and penitence were exhibited, in both cases the subjects were baptized—that is, immersed, in the name of the ‘sacred three’, or in the name of the Lord. In both cases the *rite* was performed by the authority of the same God, embraced the same subjects, and was performed in the same way.

The conclusion is, that John’s ministry and baptism was the introduction of the Gospel dispensation. And as the meaning of baptizo is to dip, and as he baptized *in Jor-*

dan, the conclusion is fair and morally certain. that baptism is an immersion of the body in water. And as he baptized those and those *only* who brought forth fruits meet for repentance, the conclusion is equally obvious that repentant and believing sinners are the only scriptural subjects of this sacred institution.

CHAPTER IX.

THE BAPTISM OF CHRIST.

NEXT comes the baptism of Christ. He had no sins of which he could repent. Mr. F. remonstrates against the baptism of Christ on common principles for this very reason.* But when he baptizes Christ as an induction to the priest's office, he tacitly admits that Christ was a sinner! I mean his system implies this. The high priest was washed or bathed in water, and *sprinkled* too, because he was a sinner and needed purification and atonement on account of his own sin.

The idea that Jesus was inducted into the priesthood by baptism, is not only unscriptural and unreasonable, as I shall show directly, but absolutely *degrading* to Christ. The Saviour was baptized to 'fulfill all righteousness;' or, as Campbell has rendered the passage, 'to ratify every institution,' not to fulfil the law of Moses nor the law of priesthood; for neither the one nor the other required him to be baptized of John in Jordan. It was proper that he should honor and sanction the baptism of John, that is, the baptism of the gospel, and in this way 'leave us an example that we might follow his steps.' What honest disciple will not say, "let me be baptized as my Saviour was baptized!" 'When he putteth forth his own sheep, he goeth before them, and the sheep follow him, for they know his voice,' and they reverence his example.

Our Redeemer was 'baptized of John in Jordan.' He comes up out of the water! The heavens are opened! The Spirit descends! The Eternal Father speaks! Now, reader, I will leave two questions with your conscience. After learning that baptism means immersion, and that Christ was baptized *in* the river of Jordan, and that after baptism, he came up out of the water, can you believe that Christ was sprinkled? 2d. If Christ was immersed,

*He was not baptized as a sign of purification, but as an emblem of his future death and resurrection. See Macknight on Rom. vi : 4.

do you not wish to copy his example? Answer these two questions for *yourself*, in view of that day when you will meet this Jesus in the character of your Judge!

But Christ's baptism, says Mr. F. was not Christian! He thinks that Christ was sprinkled!!!! I bring not railing accusation against him; but I think sooner or later the 'Lord will rebuke him.' He has learned, moreover, that Christ was *inducted* into the office of priest by baptism! Whence did he obtain this intelligence? Not from the Bible. There is not a word in that blessed book which leads to this conclusion. On the contrary, it contradicts plainly and overthrows entirely this strange notion. But he has told us from whom he received his sentiment on this subject. He derived it from Scott, Clarke, Coggeshall, Read, and two other commentators." They received it of other Pædobaptist Rabbies, and so it is handed down from generation to generation. And if any man dares to question the authority of such names, he is denounced as a heretic, or accused of using 'ridicule and vulgarity and personal abuse.' Where religion is guarded by the Pope, or by civil law, confiscation, or imprisonment, or death follows. But as we live in a free country, and I do not fear a 'Pope's bull,' nor the anathema of a prelatial council, nor the '*resolved unanimously*' of the 1st Congregational church, I shall venture to refer the reader to a few plain passages of the inspired word of God, which will, I trust, *show* the absurdity of this notion, and set this matter at rest. That Jesus Christ is a priest forever, is a *truth* in which my soul rejoices. That he was consecrated to the work of a high priest, by being baptized of John in Jordan, is a sentiment *unscriptural*, childish and degrading. For, 1st. If the Jewish law of priesthood be regarded, the candidate inducted must have been of the order of Aaron and the tribe of Levi. But, says St. Paul, Heb. vii: 14, 'It is evident that our Lord sprang out of the tribe of *Judah*, of which tribe Moses said nothing concerning priesthood. Of course, according to the law which regulated priesthood, Christ was not eligible to that office. If he were inducted by baptism

into the office of a Jewish priest, then John and our Saviour evidently violated the law of Moses, for the law did not admit, much less did it *require*, this service at their hands. The reader will understand me. It was contrary to law to take any one who did not belong to the tribe of Levi and induct him into the office of priest. But neither John nor our Saviour ever claimed any such thing. Says Paul, Heb. vii. 'Christ is a priest after the order of Melchisedec, and not after the order of Aaron.' We have no evidence that Melchisedec was baptized in Jordan into his office. The apostle proceeds: 'For the *priesthood being changed*, there is made of necessity a change also of the law.' 12. Who is made, (that is, inducted or constituted,) not after the law of a carnal commandment, but after the power of an endless life.' 16. How plain is this language. Shall we degrade the office of Christ, by lowering it down to an equality with Aaron's? Here are insurmountable objections to the idea that Christ was inducted by baptism into the office of priest.

But if Mr. F. can surmount these *insurmountable* objections, he only rises out of one difficulty to plunge into another. If Christ were under the law relating to priesthood, then he was bound, as a matter of course, to keep the *whole* law. He must appear in sacerdotal vestments, a 'linen coat,' 'girdle,' 'breeches,' and 'bonnet,' for without these it was *death* for the high priest to officiate at the altar of God. He must be consecrated solemnly, not in the wilderness, but in the temple; not by John the Baptist, but by his regular predecessors in the Jewish priesthood; not only by 'washing in pure water,' but 'by offering a bullock for a sin-offering, a ram for a burnt-offering,' &c. &c. Then he must take the oversight of the temple and all the furniture thereof; he must slay, burn and pour out the blood of the sacrifices, put the shew-bread upon the golden altar, &c.; for all these things were plainly and positively enjoined on priests by the law of God, which must be sacredly regarded.

I do hope this is the last time that the glorious priesthood of Christ shall be degraded, unthinking readers deceived, and the hearts of pious, intelligent Christians pain-

ed, by that anti-scriptural and foolish notion, that Christ was '*poured*' or '*sprinkled*' into his priestly office, when Paul says there has been a change in the priesthood and a change of the law which regulated it; that Christ does not belong to the order of Aaron, but is a priest forever, after the order of Melchisedec—not by the law of a carnal commandment, or '*carnal ordinances*,' such as washing or *sprinkling*, but after the power of an endless life.

But perhaps it will be said, 'Christ did not regard the law of priesthood only in the act of consecration to his office work.' Ah! then the law of priesthood, like the law of circumcision is ever *elastic*. The latter originally took in male children and servants; but it can easily be contracted at one end, so as to leave out the servants, and so stretched at the other end, as to take in *females*, if they have the good fortune to be born of believing parents; if not, the poor things must be left without the benefits of this India rubber law, or ever elastic covenant. At first, they were to be circumcised at eight days old; but now, the law can be elongated to eight weeks, or eight months, or eight years; or it may be contracted to the first instant of their nativity, when they come into the world *crying and begging* for 'Christian circumcision.' (See the decision of the council of Carthage.) So the priest under the law must originally belong to the tribe of Levi, and be consecrated in the temple, by a regular priest; he must be clothed in sacerdotal robes and offer sacrifices, &c. But now the law is so altered and amended and garbled and interpolated, by those who ought to have been better employed, that a man may be selected from the tribe of Judah, and be consecrated in the wilderness, not by a Jewish priest who waits at the altar, but by a man clothed in camels' hair, with a leathern girdle about his loins, living on locusts and wild honey, and lifting up his voice like a trumpet, and crying 'prepare ye the way of the Lord,' and by being baptized in Jordan! And when by the law of priesthood he has been inducted into office, the law has nothing more to do with him! Have we not some *wonderful* laws in this *wonderful* world? Let me

ask in sorrow, is it strange that infidelity abounds, when Christians and Christian *ministers* treat the laws of God in this manner? Infidels have nothing to do more than to take the same unwarrantable license with the Bible on other subjects, which has been taken in these lectures with regard to the subject of baptism, adopt the same laws of interpretation, and they may fritter away the meaning and destroy the authority of the whole Bible!

CHAPTER X.

GREEK PREPOSITIONS.

THE Bible informs us that in performing baptism, 'They went down into the water,' and (after baptism,) 'came up out of the water.' See Acts viii:38, Mat. iii:16; that John baptized his subjects 'in Jordan,' Mat. iii:5, 6, Mark i:5. But Mr. F. has ascertained that *eis* and *en* mean *to* and not *into*, and *apo* means *from* and not *out of*, in the above cases. He says, p. 40, 'It might be rendered with propriety in the above passages, that they were baptized of him *at* the river Jordan, or *by* the river Jordan, or *with* the river Jordan. Again, p. 49, on Acts viii:38, he thinks it ought to be rendered, 'they went down *to* the water, and came up *from* the water.' He has spent much time in counting and balancing these Greek prepositions. To all this I briefly reply, 1st. I have no fear that any unbiassed Greek scholar will ever pronounce his criticisms deep, or his remarks forcible and profound; for every Greek scholar knows that the above passages are correctly rendered in our version of the New Testament, and that *his* rendering cannot be adopted without marring the beauty and destroying the force of the passages, and doing injustice to the evident meaning of the original texts. To those who have no acquaintance with the Greek language, it may be well to say: 1st. The translators of the New Testament into our language, were *Pædobaptists*, and would not be likely to render these particles so as to have them militate against their own practice, unless compelled to do so by a candid regard to the obvious meaning of the original and a sacred love for truth. When therefore they tell us that John baptized his candidates in Jordan, that 'Christ when he was baptized came up out of the water,' that in attending to baptism 'they came to (*epi*) the water, and they went down into (*eis*) the water, both baptizer and subject, and after baptism, came up out of the water,' &c. it is a very fair and certain conclusion, that the original required this construction.

2d. The common reader will be able to estimate the value of Mr. F.'s criticism, by rendering the following passages, Luke viii : 29, Mark v : 13, according to his plan : 'For he had commanded the unclean spirit to come (*apo*) from the man.' Did he not come out of the man? 'He was driven of the devils (*eis*) at or to the wilderness.' 'Many devils were entered (*eis*) to him.' Did they not enter into the man and come out of him? 'And they besought him that he would not command them to go out (*eis*) to the deep. And there was there a herd of many swine feeding' (*en*) at the mount, or by the mount, or with the mount, 'and they besought him that he would suffer them to enter (*eis*) to the swine. Then went the devils (*apo*) from the man and entered (*eis*) to the swine; and they (the herd) ran violently down a steep place (*eis*) to the sea, and were choked (*eis*) to the sea.' We must believe, according to Mr. F., that these 'two thousand' swine were choked to the sea, that is. they were suffocated on some sand bank.

3. 'The wicked shall go away (*eis*) kolasin aionion, to punishment eternal. Is this correct?

4. Again, Acts viii : 'They came to a certain water and they went down into the water.' Two participles are employed in the original : 'They came (*epe*) to the water, and they went down (*eis*) into the water.' How evident it must be, not only to the scholar, but to the man of unbiassed good sense, that this passage in Acts is correctly rendered in our English Testament.

Again, John vi : 16, 17, 'His disciples went down (*epe*) to the sea, and entered (*eis*) into a ship.' Mark xvi : 2, 5, 'They came (*epe*) to the sepulchre, and entering (*eis*) into the sepulchre.' That *apo* is often used to signify out of, is evident from many passages. I will mention two or three : Matt. xiv : 29, 'And when Peter was come (*apo*) out of the ship (not from the ship) he walked on the water to go to Jesus.' Luke viii : 2. 'Mary called Magdalene (*apo*) out of whom (not from whom) went seven devils.' See also verses 12, 33, 35. 38. Again, Luke ii : 4, 'And Joseph also went up from

Galilee (*apo*) *out of* the city of Nazareth (*eis*) *into* Judea, &c. But these examples are sufficient to show, that Mr. F.'s criticisms on this subject are slender and superficial. *Truth* will yet bear the test of examination. It is certain that our Pædobaptist translators and the Greek church know as much about the nature, use and power of Greek prepositions, as our lecturer, and they say, Matt. iv: 18, 'Casting a net (*eis ten thalassan*) *into the sea*,' &c. Matt. xvii: 15, 'For oft times he falleth (*eis to pur, kai pollaxis eis to udor*) *into the fire* and oft times *into the water*. Matt. vi: 6, 'But when thou prayest, enter (*eis to tamicion*) *into thy closet*.' Matt. xviii: 30, 'Cast him (*eis phulaken*) *into prison*.' Rev. xviii: 21, 'Took up a stone like a great mill-stone and cast it (*eis ten thalassan*) *into the sea*. It will not, I presume, be denied that the first and ordinary meaning of *en* is *in*, that of *ek* *out of*, that of *eis*, *into*. But on p. 49, he says in a note, that the advocates of immersion dwell on *this* as their main argument, that they find these expressions; 'they went into and came out of the water'! This is a base misrepresentation, or an *inexcusable mistake*; for all who know any thing about the arguments of the Baptists, know better. They know that our main argument is the meaning of the word baptizo, which is to *dip*, to *immerse*, and that we simply argue from the fact that they went *into* the river Jordan, and *into* a certain water, that we have in these accounts of baptism, strong *collateral* evidence, that they adhered to the common primary meaning of the word employed, and *immersed* their candidates. And Prof. Stuart has the candor to acknowledge that no other good reason can be given why they resorted to these places for baptism, unless it were to immerse their subjects.

But he complains that we 'resort to ridicule, and talk of Jonah's being thrown *at* the sea, and the wicked being turned *by* hell.' I reply there is not ridicule, but awful truth in this case; but I am sorry, while he evidently feels the force of truth, that he should attempt to parry its strokes by the cry of 'ridicule.' Have I not

as good a right to cast Jonah *at* the sea, as he has to cast my blessed Saviour *at* Jordan, when God has said in his book that he was baptized *in* the river of Jordan, and that he then came up out of the water? May I not solemnly warn him of the danger of adopting the same laws which infidels adopt in explaining the Bible, without being accused of using ridicule? I can assure him that when I penned the sentence to which he refers, my mind was too solemn to indulge in any thing which deserves the name of ‘ridicule.’ There were in my address *plainness* and *point*, I acknowledge. I thought that the case demanded and the author deserved them—and I believe so still.

CHAPTER XI.

ATTENDING CIRCUMSTANCES OF BAPTISM.

To all that Mr. Fowler has said on this topic, nothing more is necessary than to expose the *sophism* which he has laid down at the commencement, on which he bases all his remarks. If his arguments all rest on a false principle, it is only requisite to remove that false foundation, and all the fine materials which he has laid upon it, tumble at once to the ground. On p. 37, he says, 'The advocates of immersion are bound to show that *all* the attending circumstances of all the cases recorded, prove that immersion, and nothing else, is baptism.' *Indeed!* I am glad Mr. F. is not king in Egypt, and the poor advocates of immersion slaves under his despotic government: for they would doubtless be made to serve with rigor. He would take 'away their straw and demand the full tale of brick' at their hands. How easily he would vanquish the Baptists, if they would only stand still and let him put out their eyes and tie their hands behind them. But they have some idea of their own rights. They have some notions about what they are bound to prove, according to the laws of fair reasoning and manly debate. The Baptists, *he* says, 'are bound to *prove* that all the attending circumstances of *all* the cases recorded, prove that immersion, and nothing else, is baptism.' To show the fairness and force of this principle, or rather this sophism, let us take another word and look at another subject. Take the Greek word *Thapto*, which signifies to bury. This is the very word which the Holy Ghost has used in describing baptism. 'We are buried *in* baptism,' 'buried *by* baptism.' We can easily show that *thapto* signifies to cover up, or entomb in the earth. Lexicographers, critics and classic usage, and the history of nations show, that this is the meaning of *thapto*; at least, that it is the *primary* and *prevailing* sense of the word. Consequently when we read in Luke xvi., (whether this account be called a parable or not, does not affect the argument); that the rich

man died and was buried, we conclude that the common sepulchral rites were performed and the body was buried, that is, covered up in the earth, or entombed. And this conclusion is dictated by good sense and sound logic, and by the laws of fair interpretation. No, Mr. F. may say, you are bound to show that *all* the attending circumstances of *all* the burials recorded in the Bible prove that covering up in the earth, or entombing, and nothing else, is burying. The rich man was buried, but there is not one word said about the mode in which he was buried. It might have been covering up in the earth, or it might have been sprinkling or pouring a few particles of dust in his face—no mortal can tell which. And unless you can prove that there was a burying ground within half a mile, and a sexton in the place whose business was to dig graves, and that he was actually in town at the time, and did certainly dig a grave for this rich man—and that there was also a coffin-maker at hand, who did make a coffin for the rich man, and put him in it, and that they did actually carry him out and cover him all over with earth;—unless you can prove all these things, my position is established. viz. that *thapto* means to pour or sprinkle a little sand or earth on the face of the dead. For if you cannot prove *all* these things, it is possible—nay, *probable*—nay, to all candid minds *certain*, that affusion is one mode of burying. For he was probably buried on the spot in the very room where he died. There is not one word said about his being carried to a public burying ground—no. It says he died and was buried—that is all. (See his 46th and 47th pages.) Nothing is said about the mode of burying; every man has a right to choose his own mode. But suppose they carried out the body and actually laid him into the grave, this is no proof that they covered him up in earth an inch deep. (See the case of the eunuch, p. 49.) Nay, he was probably laid into the grave that he might be sprinkled or poured. Would there be a particle of proof that the rich man was buried, that is, covered up in the earth, because they carried him to the grave and laid him (*eis*) to it. For *eis* means *to* or *at* the grave, not *into* it. Besides, perhaps no grave was dug. There was no sex-

ton, or he had not the necessary implements for grave digging. And, finally, every unbiassed mind must conclude that in all probability the rich man was buried by having a little earth sprinkled on his face in the very room where he died.” “And again we are told, in the book of Numbers, xith chapter, that the *thousands* ‘which lusted, and whose carcasses fell in the wilderness, were *all* buried.’—Surely they could not *all* have been covered up in the earth—the thing seems impossible. Can any candid man believe that graves were dug for all these in the wilderness?”

Now this is a fair specimen of Mr. F’s. logic when he deals with the Baptists. The Greek word *Thapto* is not more definite, as every Greek scholar knows, than is *Baptizo*. I can easily affix on the very same principle, as many meanings to *Thapto*, as he has done to *Baptizo*. I wish it to be remembered that this comparison is not far-fetched nor unauthorized; for an inspired Apostle has said, ‘we are *buried by* and *in* baptism.’ Mr. F. may wish in the last case to send me off to look for a burying ground and a sexton and a spade and hoe and a coffin maker and pall bearers, in order to prove that the rich man was buried; he would be glad to send me away to Damascus and Cesarea and Philippi, to find the bath or pond or river, in which Paul and the converts in Cesarrea, and the jailor were baptized; he may wish me to guage with a *Pædobaptist* rule, the depth of the water in that region, but I shall not run on his errands. I believe I understand my own business in relation to this affair. I believe that every man who can feel the force of a proposition and the power of argument will at once perceive that the burden of proof lies on the advocates of sprinkling. I have said that *Thapto* means to bury, and when it is said that the rich man died and was buried, they must admit that he was covered up in the earth, or entombed unless there is something in the circumstances which absolutely forbids the idea that he was buried in the common way. This he cannot do, for nothing is said about the manner of his burial. I have shown clearly if there is truth in axioms. and any meaning in language, that *baptizo* means to im-

merse. He must show therefore that the idea of immersion is absolutely excluded, or else admit that immersion is intended, wherever baptism is mentioned. 'A word should always be taken in its primary and prevailing signification, unless something in the nature of the case demands *another*, a secondary meaning.' Now I do not beg an acceptance of this rule, I *demand* it. Nor will any candid manly reasoner object to it. It is the canon adopted in the examination of all other subjects; it is the only one that can be safely employed in discussing the subject of baptism. We conclude that Paul, and the converts at Cesarea, and the jailor, &c. were immersed, because the meaning of baptizo and the common practice lead to this conclusion, and there is nothing in the circumstances of these baptisms, which *forbids* the idea of immersion. This Prof. Stuart and candid and enlightened Pædobaptists generally acknowledge.—The action of burying and baptizing is not always described by the inspired penmen, nor was this necessary. But when the places and the manner in which baptism was performed *are* mentioned, they uniformly favor the idea of immersion. Where the place and manner in which this rite was performed are not mentioned, nothing *against* immersion or in favor of affusion can be inferred. I have presented to his view the sacred pioneer of our Lord, baptizing his candidates *in Jordan*. In the case of Christ's baptism, we have seen him after being baptized, coming up *out* of the waters of Jordan. We have seen on another occasion that John was baptizing in Enon, because there was much water there, and the people came and were baptized. At another time, we have seen the administrator and the candidate 'come to a certain water, and then *both go down into the water*,' attend to baptism, and then 'come up out of the water.' I think no man of good sense will deny that these cases strongly favor the idea of immersion. And these are all the cases in the Bible in which the action or immediate circumstances of place and manner are particularly described. These are all-sufficient. These certainly favor Baptist views on this subject. Let the same description be given of a baptizing in Fall River,

and every one will say, these people who practice thus, who baptize in the river, go down into the water and come up out of the water, *these are Baptists*. Now let Mr. F. instead of laying out too much work for us, just point us to the place in the New Testament, (I ask but for *one* instance) in which water was brought in before the candidate and then the baptizer wet his fingers in the basin of water, and sprinkled the water in the candidate's face; or rubbed his baptized fingers across his forehead, saying I baptize thee, &c. But we must have plain scriptural evidence that a basin was used and the candidate sprinkled, because sprinkling is not the meaning of baptism any more than it is of burying. The figments of his imagination wrought up into positive *assertions* strong as 'solid rock' will not be admitted as valid proof. All that Mr. Fowler has said on the attending circumstances of baptism, fall to the ground, because his speculations are founded on false principles, viz. that 'one of the prominent meanings of baptizo is affusion.' This is asserted, but it is not yet proved. It cannot be proved fairly.

2nd. That the 'Baptists are bound to show that all the circumstances in *all* the cases recorded prove that immersion and nothing else is baptism.' I have shown that they are bound to prove no such thing. As he practices affusion he is bound to show, if he appeals to circumstances, at least in some *one* instance, that baptism was administered, not in Jordan, not in a bath, pond nor brook, but out of a basin. When he shall have done this, I will engage to consider such a circumstance or fact as favoring his practice.

These remarks contain all that the arguments require, and all that the lectures deserve. But I will just observe, the author has made several unwarrantable assertions, and employed several sickly arguments, which it may be well to notice briefly. Of the latter class are his speculations about 'watering his beasts at Enon', and 'holding a camp meeting at P.', on page 40. The Bible informs us why John resorted to Enon; it was not to water thirsty beasts, nor for the purpose of holding a 'camp meeting', but for the purpose of baptizing. I prefer Bible testimony to

Mr. Fowler's whims. On page 41, he says, in relation to Christ's baptism, that we conclude he was immersed, and that 'this belief is founded entirely upon the words *out of.*' This is not correct. I can only express my sorrow at the ignorance or willful misrepresentation of our belief and its basis, which that sentence betrays. With regard to the baptism of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost, there are several baseless and yet very positive assertions. Indeed it would seem that there was an intention to make up in *positiveness* of diction what was wanting in *fact.* The statements on pages 44 and 45, that 'these were *all* baptized by twelve men', that 'they could not have had a change of garments', that 'they could have no access to the temple', that 'no baths could be had', that 'several sermons were preached and many exhortations given', that 'affusion is one prominent mode of baptism', are altogether unproved and unfounded assertions, and nearly every one of them plainly contradicted by the word of God.

It is not true that 'they could have no access to the temple.' For we are told in the same chapter and in the same paragraph, 'they were daily *in* the temple praising God and having favor with all the people.'—*See Acts ii: 46, 47.* Besides, it is probable they were occupying a chamber or an 'upper room' in the temple at the time of the Spirit's descent. After the ascension of Christ from Bethany, they (the Apostles and brethren) 'returned to Jerusalem with great joy, and were *continually in the temple* praising and blessing God'.—*See Luke xxvi: 52, 53.* Does Mr. F. suppose that the church of one hundred and twenty, and the three thousand converts, and perhaps four times as many more, all met together in the upper room of some private dwelling? Or did they hold a 'camp meeting' in the streets of Jerusalem? I conclude they were in the temple—because the Bible declares they returned to Jerusalem after their Lord's ascension, and were *continually in the temple.* The testimony of the Bible is enough for me. Those who think that unfounded assertions, which contradict the Bible, are to be preferred, will, of course, receive them, and perhaps call

them 'unanswerable arguments'. Mr. F. has declared that the Jewish church is the same with the Gospel church. But he had forgotten their identity when he declared that the church could 'have no access to the temple.' The Jewish church would not let the Gospel church come near the temple—yet these two churches are one and the same church!! The meaning then must be this—the church was so opposed to the church, that the church would give the church no access to the temple!! If the people in this region possess good sense—and I believe they do—and if they *use* it, as I think they will, such arguments as the above will not injure the Baptist cause. For the honor of Pædobaptism it is desirable that lectures which contain such arguments should be 'like angels' visits, few and far between.'

There is not the least difficulty in accounting for the immersion of the three thousand on the day of Pentecost. 1. There were administrators enough. Twelve men could easily perform the work. They had the day before them. There was only one short sermon preached by Peter after 9 o'clock in the morning.—*See Acts ii.* But the strong probability is, that all the administrators were together on that extraordinary occasion. If so, there were eighty-two baptizers. 2. There were places enough in which to baptize. They might all have been baptized in the temple. There stood the molten sea, containing two or three thousand baths of water; also the ten brass lavers, holding forty baths; and there was the 'dipping room.' After ten o'clock, A. M. three thousand might have been baptized without leaving the temple. Again, there were the two pools of Siloam and Bethesda. The pool of Bethesda (if Mr. F.'s Greek lexicographer, viz. Brown, has correctly described it in his Bible dictionary) was large enough to accomodate them all. It was '120 paces long, 40 broad, and 8 feet deep.' Lastly, three thousand might have been baptized in private baths. There can be no question but ten times that number of private citizens and strangers bathed themselves in Jerusalem *every day*. And yet some labor to fasten in 'ignorant minds' the belief that Jerusalem was one of

the dryest places on earth ! They would make us believe that there was not water enough in that populous city for baptismal purposes.

But the *knock-down* argument is, ‘they could have made no previous arrangement for a change of garments’ !! This reminds of the *dripping* argument of a good old Congregational dame in my native town. Speaking of the baptism of the eunuch, she said, ‘*He* was not immersed, because he had only one suit of clothes with him—and he could not go on his way *rejoicing*, with his wet clothes *drip—drip—drip* as he went along.’ Such arguments excite no alarm in my mind. They may bolster up Pædobaptism a while longer. I will, however, just inquire, is it likely that strangers visited Jerusalem without changes of raiment ? Could not those who were citizens at home possibly procure a change of garments ? Clothing in that warm climate was very light, and it was common to have ‘many changes of raiment.’

I have, perhaps, dwelt too long on this subject. I am sorry that the cause of Pædobaptism requires such slender and sophistical arguments and such reckless and unfounded assertions to sustain it as are found in these lectures, under the caption of ‘Attending circumstances of baptism.’

If the reader wishes to see his other statements answered, in relation to the baptism of Paul and Cornelius, &c., I would refer him to my Address, pp. 51, 52, 53. I believe that a careful investigation of this part of the subject will show clearly that here is nothing which favors affusion. It is enough to know that no instance of sprinkling, or of using a basin of water in baptism, is found in the New Testament ; no instance in which water was brought to the candidate. But in every instance where the action is *described* at all, the candidate accompanied the administrator to some river or place where ‘there was much’ water, or to a ‘certain water,’ for the purpose of *being immersed*, that is, *baptized*. With these remarks I leave the intelligent reader to draw his own conclusions.

Mr. F. says, p. 46, that ‘These circumstances show, *positively* and conclusively, that Paul was baptized in that very room where he was’ !!! It would not be more rash

to say, 'the rich man died and was buried.' This shows, *positively* and conclusively, that the rich man was buried in that very room where he died; for there is not one word said about his grave, nor his being carried out, nor of his being covered up in the earth! Again, it is plain that the mode was affusion'!! Plain! why? Because *nothing* is said in that account *where* or *how* he was baptized!—Negative evidence proves a thing *positively* and conclusively! Now I say it is plain that he was immersed; not from the account itself, but from the meaning of the *word*, and the universal practice. I conclude that the rich man was covered up in the earth, because this answers to the meaning of the word and the custom of burying. For the same reasons, precisely, Paul was immersed. 2d, Paul informs us that God, by his servant Ananias, called upon him to 'arise and be baptized, and wash away his sins, &c. Acts xxii: 16. It was *not* arise and be poured ('like wine or milk') and sprinkle or affuse away your sins! No; such a mandate never issued from the court of heaven. He says, 'Every man, nay, every child knows, that washing does not ordinarily mean immersing.' True, washing *never* means immersing.—But washing is often the consequence of immersion. The passage should have read, arise and be immersed, (*baptisai*) and wash away (*apolousai*) thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord. Washing is neither *sprinkling* nor the *effect* of sprinkling. Again he says, 'In washing we uniformly put the water upon *us*.' Perhaps *he* does, but some among us apply themselves to the waters of Mount Hope bay, when they wash. Did the Jews when they immersed or bathed themselves daily, 'put the water upon them'? Did Naaman when he washed by dipping (or as it is in the Septuagint) baptizing himself) seven times in Jordan, 'put the water upon him'? But finally Paul declares that he and the Christians at Rome were '*buried* by baptism.' Rom. vi: 4. Surely he was not buried by sprinkling 'there in that room by Ananias.' p. 47. This 'baptism of Paul, then, settles the question'; baptism is immersion. But perhaps Mr. F. enquires still, where was he im-

mersed? That is not material. Perhaps in the house where he was: baths were common in that country.—When *he* has found the ‘rich man’s grave, I will find the bath, or river, or pool, where Paul was immersed. I have as good a right to pack him off after the one, as he has to send me in pursuit of the other. The Bible says that he died and was buried; I believe it, though I know not the ‘place of his sepulchre.’ Paul says he was *buried* in baptism. I believe him, though I know not the body of water in which he was immersed or *buried*. But on p. 47 we learn that the baptism of ‘Cornelius and his family and neighbors proves his position *beyond all debate*; that is, that affusion is baptism! Pray tell us what that evidence is, which is *so* ‘conclusive,’ and before which the ‘advocates of immersion have to retreat? Why, any man may see for himself, by reading the last part of the 10th of Acts. It is nothing more or less than this: in the account there is not a word said about the manner in which they were baptized! One would suppose that he had actually come to a precious text which contained a basin of water and a ‘sprinkling priest.’ But alas! while he carries both along in his imagination, he cannot find either in the sacred text. He takes the question of the apostle, ‘who can forbid water?’ and tries to splice on a Pædobaptist meaning; ‘that is, evidently, “can any man forbid that water should be brought.” But the apostle says not a word about a vessel, or about bringing in water.

There is a better reason, I think, why Peter agitated this question. This was a new case. The gospel for the first time was now preached to the Gentiles, with the Holy Ghost sent down from heaven. It took effect; sinners were converted; these were proper subjects for gospel baptism. But the Jews had no idea that the poor outcast Gentiles were to participate with them in the blessings of redemption. The Lord had taught Peter, by a vision that when *He* should cleanse the Gentiles by his word and Spirit, they must not be considered unclean: but the Jewish brethren who came with Peter, were not prepared to give up their long-rooted prejudices against the

uncircumcised Gentiles, and receive them into their fellowship and admit them to the ordinances of the church. Peter anticipated their objections, and endeavored to remove them, and while they stood astonished 'because that on the Gentiles was poured out the gift of the Holy Ghost'—'Then said Peter, Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?' To show that they, as recipients of the Holy Ghost, had a right to baptism, whether Jews or Gentiles, was evidently his object.—There is no more proof in this passage that affusion is baptism, than there is in the first verse of Genesis. And yet he says, this proves that doctrine '*beyond all debate.*' I do not see much cause for debate, for there is nothing here, (except his unwarrantable assertions) to disprove; and I do not know how 'to retreat' before *nothing*, nor how to confute *nothing*, and yet do it in a Christian-like, manly and logical way.

CHAPTER XII.

PASSAGES FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT, WHICH ARE QUOTED TO PROVE THAT AFFUSION IS BAPTISM.

MR. F. has referred us to two passages in the Old Testament, to prove that sprinkling is baptism. Strange that he should reject evidence in favor of immersion, drawn from the baptism of John and *Christ* in the New Testament, because this was not Christian baptism, and then go back to Old Testament prophets, to learn what is baptism! But what are his texts? 1st. Ezek. xxxvi : 35. This I have already answered. 2d. Isai. lii : 15, 'So shall he *sprinkle* many nations, kings shall shut their mouths at him,' &c. On looking into the cottage Bible, I find (*in loco*) these remarks in a note: "*So shall he sprinkle*. This word is difficult of interpretation. The original idea of the Hebrew root seems to be that of leaping, or causing to leap, either with surprise or joy. * * Taking this sense, he shall cause many nations to leap with surprise and joy; (that is, he shall rejoice or surprise many nations) the words may be applied to the effects produced by the propagation of the gospel among both Jews and Gentiles. This agrees with the following clause, 'Kings shall shut their mouths at him, or be silent with surprise and admiration in his presence.'"

This is Pædobaptist testimony. This is undoubtedly the meaning of the passage. It has no more to do with baptism, than the prediction that 'the seed of the woman shall bruise the serpent's head.' Perhaps Mr. F. will contend that this is to be done by sprinkling. As I have not the Septuagint before me, I will introduce a sentence from an article in the Christian Secretary, published at Hartford, Con. vol. 14, No. 10. I am well acquainted with the author, and am quite willing that Mr. F. should correct him if he is in error. 'So shall he sprinkle many

nations.' 'It is wonderful that any Christian man, who knows what this passage means, should ever refer it to baptism at all. It is if possible, more extraordinary that this passage should be so translated. No man who has ever seen the original, or the Septuagint, can be an honest man and refer this to baptism. If our readers will refer to the Septuagint version of Isa. lii : 15, they will find the word rendered *sprinkle*, to be *Thaumazontai* and in the plural number agreeing with *nations*, and literally rendered is as follows :—“ So shall many nations be astonished or amazed at him, and kings shall shut their mouths at him,” &c. A parallel passage is found in Luke ix : 43, John vii : 21, ‘ I have done one work and ye all (*thaumazeti*) *marvel*.’ The word never had any possible allusion to sprinkle, and the world may be challenged to produce another instance in which it was ever so rendered. Mr. F. would not render the passage in Luke, ‘ *I have* done one work and ye all (*thaumazeti*) *sprinkle!* *Sprinkle* not, that I said unto you. John iii : 7. — ‘ Ye man of Israel why (*thaumazeti*) *sprinkle* ye at this? Acts iii. 12.’—(‘*thuamazo*) *I sprinkle*.’ &c. see Gal. i : 6. ‘ *I marvel that ye so soon,*’ &c. Of course his arguments *fine spun* as they are, from this text, are not only useless, but at variance with truth.

CHAPTER XIII.

MEANING OF BAPTIZO IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Mr. F. on pp. 30, 31, labors to prove that baptism means 'affusion,' by an appeal to Mark vii : 4 ; Luke xi : 38. Heb. ix : 10 ; and 1 Cor. x : 1, 2. Let us briefly examine each of these passages. Mark vii : 3, 4, 'For the Pharisees and all the Jews, except they *wash* (*nipsontai*) their hands oft, eat not, &c. And when they come from the market, except they *wash* (*baptisontai*) they eat not.' Here are two words whose primary meanings in Greek are as distinctive and dissimilar as a common washing of the hands usually expressed by *nipito*, and an immersion of the whole body expressed by *baptizo*, and both translated *wash*. Let it be remembered that the Greek Testament declares, that 'when they come from the market, *except* they *baptize* they eat not. And many other things there be which they have received to hold, as the baptism (*baptismous*) of cups and pots and brazen vessels and of tables.' The word in this passage, if translated at all, should have been rendered *immersion*. 1. Because this is the meaning of the word. 2. Such a translation would have agreed with well established facts in the case. Mr. F. says that this was a washing 'of parts of the body, as the hands and face, by pouring or putting the water upon them.' 'Pouring or applying the water by affusion in some form, is the common and uniform mode of washing.' This last declaration is not correct. But the question is not *how we wash*, but how did these Jews *baptize*? We must be guided by facts, and not by the positive and bold assertions of the prejudiced partisan. Now, what are the facts in this case? Let the learned Grotius speak: 'They were more solicitous to cleanse themselves from the defilement they had contracted in the market, and therefore they not only *washed* their hands, but *immersed their whole bodies*.' Dr. Gill (*in loco*) gives us a quotation from Maimonides. He was a Jewish Rabbi, and of course was well acquainted with oriental customs and

the traditionary practices of his own countrymen.—‘Washed in a laver which holds forty seals of water, which are not drawn, every defiled man dips himself, and in it they *dip* all unclean vessels, as cups, pots, &c.’ Says Scaliger, ‘The more superstitious part of them (the Jews) every day, before they sat down to meat, *dipped* the whole body.’

Mr. F. inquires, p. 31, ‘Was this washing (which Mark calls baptizing) these articles (viz. cups, pots, beds, &c.) performed by immersing them, or by pouring the water upon them?’ * * ‘Can we find a particle of proof that immersion was the Jewish mode?’ Yes, Mr. F., good proof in abundance. Maimonides, who well understood the matter, says, ‘*Wherever in the law washing of the flesh or of the clothes is mentioned, it means nothing else than the dipping of the whole body in a laver.*’ Again, ‘A bed that is wholly defiled, if a man *dips* it, part by part, it is pure. A pillow or a bolster of skin, he must dip them and lift them up by their fringes. The Talmud, (a book containing the doctrines and laws of the Jews,) and Scaliger and others agree that these washings of the body, clothes, cups, tables, brazen vessels, &c., were always performed by dipping or immersing them in water.’ According to Prof. Ripley, p. 41, “Vatablus, a distinguished Professor of Hebrew at Paris, for whom the Jews of his acquaintance entertained a high regard, says, on Mark vii : 4, ‘They bathed their whole persons.’ The Jews were commanded in their law to cleanse unclean vessels by immersing them. See Lev. xi : 32. ‘Whether it be any vessel of wood, or raiment, or skin, or sack, whatsoever vessel it be wherein any work is done, it must *be put into water.*’” Says Judson, on this passage, ‘What is more probable than that they abused the first institution of this ceremony by superstitiously immersing a variety of articles, not included in the divine command.’ And then adds, while addressing his Asiatic brethren, ‘It will not seem strange to you that the Jews, on returning from the market, *immersed* themselves; for you are acquainted with the customs of these eastern countries, and witness the frequent ceremonial immersion of the natives.’

See his sermon on Baptism, preached in Calcutta in 1812, page 10.

It is useless to reason against *facts*. ‘Is it not plain to every unbiassed mind, that Mark and Luke use this word in these passages, as they do elsewhere, to signify’ *immersion*? I know that Lightfoot and others have contended that this passage in Mark referred to two different ways of washing the *hands*, viz. by pouring water on them, and plunging or immersing them in water.

‘And ’tis a poor relief they gain,
To change the place—but keep the pain.’

In that case the meaning of the word remains. It is immersion and nothing else, whether the hands only or the whole body be dipped. But their reasoning is not logical; their interpretation is not fair. When the Jews mentioned *baptism*, an immersion of the whole body was understood, unless some exception was specified. *Baptizo* and *louo* with them always meant a washing of the whole person; *nipto* the washing of some parts of the body, as the hands, face, feet, &c.

Let me here introduce the language of an Episcopalian clergyman in a letter to bishop Hoadly. “The writers of the New Testament make use of two words, *baptizo* and *louo*, which leads us to the precise meaning of baptism, the latter of which is almost the constant word of the Septuagint, [the Greek version of the Old Testament], in those very numerous places where bathing or washing the whole body is commanded, in contradiction to every other practice of washing the hands or feet, or sprinkling or washing clothes. *Lousetai udati* occurs no less than eleven times in one chapter, where bathing the body is appointed on sundry occasions as a distinct rite from washing the hands or garments, &c. Since, therefore, *lousetai udati*, used times without number in the Old Testament, never imports less than bathing or washing the whole body—it follows, that baptism means the same, when it is expressed by ‘our body washed in pure water.’” This is enough to answer all that Mr. F. has said on *washing*, in Mark vii: 4, the washing of Judith, &c.

Mr. F. inquires, 'Did you ever know a table to be washed by immersion'? Yes, Mr. F. and so have you, if you believe the testimony of the Holy Ghost in Mark vii: 4, and testimony to the same fact by the Jewish Talmud and Jewish Rabbies, and by Grotius and Scaliger, Vatablus and Gill. This testimony is enough to satisfy me. It will be remembered, however, that these Jewish 'tables' were not like ours, but a kind of couches upon which they reclined at meals. The original word is *klinon*, properly speaking, couches for reclining on at table—though *kline* may signify any chair or bed. In the Cottage Bible, under Mark vii: 3, is this note: '*Except they wash—Gr. baptize.* Daily bathing was, and is, frequently practiced in the East, and it is probable that all the richer Pharisees had baths in their own premises; when, therefore, they came from the markets, where they were compelled to mix with Gentiles, and thereby contract ceremonial defilement, they probably *bathed* before they dressed for dinner,' &c. To use the bath before dinner was a common practice in eastern countries; and it is not at all strange that these Jews who considered immersion as a religious purification, should have wondered that Christ and his disciples did not immerse themselves before dinner. After looking candidly over this whole subject, I cannot see the propriety nor feel the force of Mr. F.'s remarks on these passages. I leave the reader to judge for himself.

Next we are referred to Heb. ix: 10. 'Which stood only in meats and drinks and diverse *washings*—in Greek (*baptismois*) baptisms.' On which Mr. F. comments, and then, by reasoning on false principles and proving a thing by taking it for granted, he arrives at this point:—'The conclusion is *irresistible* and *certain*, that Paul uses baptizo to signify sprinkling.' I am surprised that a man of his education and intellectual prowess should reason in this manner, and present to the public such crude and *bold* and unwarrantable assertions. He says, 'the Apostle shows in the following verses that he means the various modes of cleansing under the law, the most frequent of which was sprinkling.' The Apostle mentions the

sprinklings under the law it is true—but he no more explains the divers baptisms, than he explains the mode of eating and drinking—for meats, drinks and baptisms, are all contained in verse 10. Should I say positively that Paul explains the mode of taking these drinks in the following verses, and then roundly assert that Paul uses the word drink here to signify sprinkling!! would he admit this as sound reasoning and fair interpretation? I do not see why this reasoning would not be as logical as his own. If I were called to translate baptizo, I would as soon render it to drink as I would to sprinkle. There is no good authority for either.

To refute his reasoning in this place, I have only to demand the proof of his premisses. The whole conclusion rests on this idea:—Paul by baptisms in the text meant the various sprinklings under the law. This is not true. Mr. F. has not proved that the Apostle referred, in verse 10, to those ceremonial sprinklings at all. These sprinklings are nowhere in the Bible ever called *baptismois*. No honest man who understands the Greek language would ever dare to translate this word sprinklings. No good English scholar would ever think of saying that *sprinklings* will do in the above text, as a substitute for *washings*. The translators of our Testament have not made bad theology of the passage—for washings among the Jews, without some restrictions to qualify their meaning, always meant *immersions*.* But every unbiassed scholar knows that they departed from the laws of correct philology when they translated baptismois *washings*. It should have been translated ‘*diverse immersions*.’ This conveys the meaning of the word and the meaning of the Apostle. The Jewish ritual law enjoined numerous immersions. See Lev. xv: 16, 27.—‘He shall wash his clothes, and bathe himself in water,’ &c. See also Numbers xix: 7, 8. Says Grotius, the term *diverse washings* is used ‘because of the different persons and things washed, and not because of different sorts of washings, for there is but one way of washing, and that is by dipping.’ Altingius in his comment (*in loco*) says, ‘washings the

* That is, by *consequence*; washing, with them, was the *effect* of immersion.

Apostle calls diverse baptisms, that is, various immersions. Those Jewish washings were manifold.—*See Judson's Sermon, note p. 11.* The learned Dr. Macknight, a Pædobaptist commentator of great note, has translated Heb. ix : 10, thus :—‘ Only with meats and drinks, (*baptismois*) immersions and ordinances concerning the flesh’, &c. I rejoice that many learned men have given proof that they had a conscience. Says Dr. Gill on this passage, ‘ divers washings or baptisms ; these were the washings of the priests and of the Israelites and of sacrifices and of garments and of vessels and other things ; and because they were performed by immersion, they are called baptisms.’ Mr. F.’s conclusion is *strong*, but it is drawn, as the reader will perceive at once, from false premises. It is valueless, and cannot fail with men of discriminating minds to weaken the cause it is intended to support. Says Dr. Campbell, in his Lectures on Theology and Pulpit Eloquence, page 480 : ‘ Another error in disputation, which is by far too common, is when one will admit nothing in the plea or arguments of an adversary to have the smallest weight. I have heard a disputant of this stamp, in defiance of etymology and use, maintain that the word rendered in the New Testament *baptize*, means more properly to sprinkle, than to plunge, and in defiance of all antiquity, that the former method was the earliest, and for many centuries the most general practice in baptizing. One who argues in this manner, never fails with persons of knowledge, to betray the cause he would defend ; and though with respect to the vulgar, bold assertions generally succeed as well as arguments, sometimes better : yet a candid mind will disdain to take the help of a falsehood even in support of truth.” Mr. F. calls our attention p. 31, to I Cor. x : 1, 2 : after quoting the passage and referring to the 77 Ps. where it is said that the clouds ‘ poured out water,’ and applying this to the time of Israel’s passage through the sea, he says p. 32, ‘ Here we learn, there was thunder and lightning and rain, the clouds *poured* out water in rain upon the Israelites while they were journeying through the Red Sea, which the apostle affirms was really and truly baptism. Look, my hearers, at these facts. Moses affirms that they passed through on *dry ground*. The

Psalmist affirms that the clouds *poured out* water, and Paul affirms that the Israelites were then baptized'!!— 'Hence this baptism was certainly performed by *pouring*, Paul being judge. Paul decides the question, therefore, that baptizo signifies affusion. To his decision we cheerfully bow.'

What a medley of fanciful speculations and bold but absurd statements is here! Moses, Paul, the Psalmist, thunder, lightning, rain, clouds *pouring out* water, but *dry ground* all the time, baptism, affusion, pouring, and Mr. F. bowing before an idol of his own imagination, which he calls the decision of Paul the judge!!! To me, this looks more like *romance*, than sound theology. I am willing such arguments should pass for all that they are worth.

I would throw together a chaotic mass of *crude thoughts*, sophistical arguments and vain speculations, on some other subject, similar to his, on p. 32, for the sake of showing its absurdity; but this kind of logic would look so foolish on any other subject but that of 'affusion,' that I might be again accused of 'ridicule and vulgarity and personal abuse,' and I will forbear.

Sophistry like that employed in these lectures on I. Cor. x. 1, 2, will not escape the notice of any reader who can discern the difference between quagmire and 'solid rock.' But the query arises, what did God intend to teach us in this text, and what instruction does it afford on the subject of baptism? I answer, it appears to me, that God intended we should learn from the passage the *nature* and practical use of baptism. The term *baptism* is, by common consent, used figuratively. I might easily introduce a *host* of the most eminent Pædobaptist authors to confirm this statement, but it is not necessary. It was not then a literal baptism *in* water, nor a sprinkling *with* water. The text does not say they were baptized *in water*, but '*in the cloud and in the sea.*' The cloud was not a cloud of rain, but a 'cloud of fire,' a 'bright cloud,' which gave light unto the Israelites. If the apostle meant to say that sprinkling was baptism, he would have said, they were baptized by being sprinkled with rain from the cloud and spray from the sea. But neither Moses,

David nor Paul intimates that the Israelites were wet with water on that occasion. A man may be baptized in wind, or in fire, or in the Spirit, or in the cloud,' as well as in water. Moses assures us that 'the Israelites went through the sea on dry ground.' But if the whim that on that occasion the clouds poured out water on the Israelites, were true—the people, men, women and children must have been thoroughly drenched, and one would suppose that the ground could not have been dry. And in that case, be it remembered, the Israelites were not *poured*, the clouds did not *pour* out the children of Israel, but Mr. F. says, 'the clouds poured out *water*.' The people must have been soaked. Thus to follow out his plan correctly, we must say that baptism is *soaking*, 'Paul being judge.' But says Paul, 'all our fathers were *under* the cloud, and all passed *through the sea*, and were all baptized unto Moses *in* the cloud and *in* the sea.' That is, they were surrounded, immersed or baptized in the cloud and in the sea, for the sea 'stood like walls' on either side, and the cloud was over them and around them, and certainly they were embosomed in the cloud and *in the sea*. Surely the circumstances of the Israelites on this occasion could not have been represented under the idea of *sprinkling* or *pouring* in the cloud and in the sea. No good rhetorician would justify such language, unless he were disposed to press science into the service of *sectarianism*.

There was something in the case which resembled immersion, and therefore Paul has correctly used the term baptism. So says Witsius, a learned Pædobaptist divine, "How were the Israelites baptized in the cloud and in the sea, seeing they were neither immersed in the sea nor wetted by the cloud? It is to be considered that the apostle here uses the term baptism in a figurative sense. The clouds hung over their heads; and so the water is over those who are baptized. The sea surrounded them on each side, and so the water, in regard to those that are baptized." And in this opinion agree 'Whitby, Grotius, Venema, Gataker, Hammond, Pool's Continuator, Turretinus, and many others, 'all Pædobaptists.'

But Mr. F. says, p. 33, 'The advocates of immersion, aware that Paul here uses baptizo to signify affusion, frequently fancy that the clouds, somehow or other embosomed the Israelites as water envelopes a person immersed in it.' This sentiment was borrowed. I conclude, from 'Concord,' and he borrowed it from Dr. Dwight. But the Doctor had not the effrontery to declare that the Baptists knew that 'Paul uses baptizo to signify affusion,' while they have honestly expressed a different opinion on the subject.

Will Mr. F. regulate the 'fancy' of his own brethren? Had he lived at an earlier period, he might have instructed such men as Prof. Venema, Dr. Whitby, Witsius, Poole, and Prof. Stuart, on this text. Stuart says, p. 336, "The suggestion has sometimes been made that the Israelites were sprinkled by the cloud and by the sea; and this was the baptism which Paul meant to designate. But the cloud on this occasion was not a cloud of rain; nor do we find any intimation that the waters of the Red Sea sprinkled the children of Israel at this time. So much is true, viz. that they were not immersed. Yet as the language must evidently be figurative in some good degree, and not literal, I do not see how, on the whole, we can make less of it, than to suppose that it has a tacit reference to the idea of *surrounding*, in some way or other."

No Baptist to my knowledge ever claimed that this was a *literal immersion* in water, but a *direct* 'reference to the idea of *surrounding*'; that is to say, it was a figurative baptism. Would it not be well for Mr. F. to take this Andover Professor under his pupilage for a while, and learn him 'the way of God more perfectly'? But Mr. F. enquires "Would they consider a man duly baptized by his being placed between two cisterns of water with another cistern suspended over his head?" As this question was imported from Europe, (see Dr. Wardlow on baptism) it may be well to say in reply, we should not. Christian baptism is the immersion of a believer in water, in obedience to the command of Zion's King. The baptism of the Israelites was not a Christian ordinance, but a fact in history. A man baptizes himself every time he plunges

into the water to bathe ; but we do not consider such a man ‘duly baptized,’ in view of the law which regulates the ordinance of Christian baptism.

Mr. F. considers sprinkling as baptism. Let me ask in return, ‘Really, would he consider a man duly baptized who should happen to be sprinkled on some occasion with dust or ashes? Probably not. But does that destroy the meaning of the word sprinkle? Is not the mode of sprinkling *ashes*, the same with the mode of sprinkling *water*? Is there more than one mode of sprinkling; or more than one meaning to the word? It may have a figurative application, and so may baptism.

2. The *practical use* of baptism may be learned from the above cited passage. It is worthy of remark that in the original, the Israelites are said to be baptized, (*eis ton Mosēn*) *into Moses*. Macknight in his commentary, says. “And were all baptized into the belief of Moses’ divine commission, by their being hidden from the Egyptians in the cloud.” Says Locke, “To be baptized into the name of any person, or into a person, is solemnly to enter one’s self a disciple of him into whose name he is baptized, and to profess that he submits himself implicitly to his authority, and receives his doctrines and rules. In this sense, the Israelites were ‘baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea.’

Here an extensive field of thought opens to our view, over which we cannot now travel. I conclude this part of our subject by quoting an appropriate passage from Prof. Ripley’s Examination, p. 100. “Some of the circumstances connected with this surrender of themselves to Moses, are remarkably similar to the circumstances connected with the public surrender of believers to Christ, as their leader and deliverer. To the Israelites might be applied, in a figurative manner, language which, in its literal application, belonged to Christians. The explanation of the figure is perfectly easy. By baptism Christians avow their confidence in Christ, their choice of him and their subjection to him in all the offices which he sustains. Now, if a community had yielded themselves up to some leader, placing confidence in him, and professing subjection to

him ; and especially if, at the time of thus yielding themselves to him, any circumstances had occurred similar to those in which Christians professed their subjection to Christ, they might very happily be said to have been baptized unto or *into* that leader. The Jewish community sustained such a relation to Moses as has here been mentioned, and a circumstance of the kind alluded to, took place. As Christians, in making their profession of allegiance to Christ, are surrounded with water ; so the Israelites, when signally showing their allegiance to Moses by passing through the Red Sea, were surrounded with water. What though it was not actually over their heads ? What though they were not touched by the water ? Yet who feels that this figurative language is at all unsuitable, or difficult to be understood ? And which is the proper method of interpretation ? To employ this confessedly allusive mention of baptism for a satisfactory explanation of the Christian ordinance ? or, to learn what the Christian ordinance was, and from that to ascertain what the allusive application of it means ?”

Was it proper for Mr. F. to declare that Christian baptism was not instituted ‘till after Christ’s resurrection,’ and then go back to Exodus to find what he says ‘all *candid minds*’ will acknowledge was water baptism, and add that the ‘Israelites were really and truly baptized.’ And then, by misapplying the language of David, raise a thunder-storm and pour water on the Jews, in order to make out that baptism is pouring !!! On p. 34, he ‘adds three interesting facts.’ 1. ‘The translators of the Bible have not rendered baptizo to immerse or dip in a single instance in the New Testament.’ I will only say in this place, that no man can understand Greek and honestly translate this word by rendering it any thing else but immersion, or some word equivalent to that in meaning. I make not this statement rashly, but deliberately. I am willing to be called to an account for it, by any one who is disposed to risk his reputation by assuming the other alternative of this question.

The learned Pædobaptists, Drs. Campbell and Macknight and others, have already translated the word *immerse*.

Most of the European translators have retained the Greek word, only altering the termination; but in the Gothic, German, Dutch, Danish, Welsh and Burmese languages, terms are used in their own tongues, which correspond with the English word dip. And this is the case, so far as I know, with every translation of the word which has ever been made. It is no part of my business to either condemn or justify our Pædobaptist translators. Perhaps in translating baptizo to *wash*, in four of five instances they were deceived by the false criticism (See Classic Usage and Testimony of Lexicographers in this work;) that, because washing is the effect of immersing, and the two words may sometimes be used interchangeably, it was safe and proper to consider the one as a fair definition of the other. Perhaps they might have fallen under the sentence of their own brother, Campbell, in his note on Matt. iii : 11, ‘It is to be regretted that we have so much evidence that even good and learned men allow their judgments to be warped by the sentiments and *customs* of the sect which they prefer. The true partisan of whatever denomination, always inclines to correct the diction of the spirit by that of the party.’ His second fact I have already answered in another place. In his third fact he insinuates that baptō is more invariable in its signification than baptizo. This is a mistake. An appeal to the *usus loquendi* will show that the reverse of this is true. Having, as I trust, shown fairly that his premises are false in his first two lectures, it will, of course, appear that his inferences and recapitulation, on pp. 36 and 60, have no solid foundation. I shall therefore pass them without further notice.

We come now to notice Mr. Fowler’s third lecture, on page 61. His object is to show that “children under the care of believing, covenanting parents, are proper subjects of baptism.” His text authorizes the baptism of such as are taught, or as the text in Mark xvi : 16, (which contains the commission) says ‘*believers*,’ and none else. ‘Go *teach* and baptize,’ ‘Go preach the Gospel—he that *believeth* and is *baptized*, &c.” It would seem that he had chosen the wrong text, from which to preach infant

baptism. But this text is as good as any in the Bible, for his purpose. As infants cannot be taught successfully, so they cannot believe in Christ, and of course it is evident that they have no right to baptism; or at least it is certain that they are not included in this commission.—It is childish to maintain that a commission to baptize them who are taught, and who *believe*, includes others who are not capable of being taught, or capable of believing. This is so perfectly plain, to every man who looks at the subject with the eye of candor, and exercises common sense, that no elaborate argument is here necessary. If our government should attempt to raise an army by issuing enlisting orders, embracing every willing able bodied man between the ages of eighteen and forty-five, and one of my neighbors should ‘affirm and insist’ that these enlisting orders embraced not only such men as are therein described, but speechless *babes*—I should not think it worth my while to reason long with him on the subject. And I should not acknowledge the superiority of his mental powers nor the force of his logic, should he go on to enquire, ‘Is a child a fit subject for a soldier?’ No. But he enquires ‘why not?’ I answer, because young children are not included in the enlisting orders, and they cannot perform the duties of soldiers, nor accomplish the purpose for which our Government is raising the army. But he rejoins ‘your answer is not in point, I enquired is a *child* a proper person to be enlisted into this army? you reply by telling me that ‘a sound able-bodied, willing man is a proper person to be enlisted! Now as I ask no question about *men soldiers*, the answer is nothing to the purpose.’ Foolish sophistical reasoning says my reader. ‘The answer is in point but the question is absurd.’ I admit it, but this is the question in principle and this is the same kind of reasoning which Mr. F. has employed on page 62.

He says ‘I enquire of an opposer of infant baptism, is the young child of a believer a proper subject for baptism?’ He answers ‘No.’ ‘I ask why so?’ He replies ‘the bible says *repent* and be baptized, if thou believest thou mayest.’ I rejoin, ‘your answer is not in point. I enquired is a *child* a proper subject of baptism? you re-

ply by telling me that an adult who repents,' (or child either,) 'and believes may be baptized. Now as I ask no question about adult baptism,' (he should have said believers baptism, we care not how old or how young, if he give evidence of faith,) 'the answer is nothing to the purpose!!!' The reader will at once make the application of the above comparison. I believe he will see at once that speechless babes are as fit for soldiers, as they are for Christians. And that the reasoning in both of the above cases proceeds on the same principle.

We must is seems take it for *granted* that a babe if born of believing parents is a proper subject for baptism. For the sake of argument, I will prove that a lamb is a subject of baptism, by taking it for granted in the same way. If he says any thing about the qualifications of candidates for that rite, I will meet him at every turn, with 'your answer is not to the point.' But says he 'it is evident that a child must be under the care of a believing parent.'— 'Not in point, Sir,' I ask no question about a child. I enquired if my *lamb* might be baptized? but he replies the question is absurd, for God does not require *lambs* to be baptized. Agreed, he does not require it, nor has he ever required us to baptize unconscious babes.

"But God did require the Jews to offer up their children in circumcision," and he has never forbidden parents to offer up their children under the Gospel. Well, what of that? God once required the Jews to offer up their *lambs* in sacrifice, and where has God said that a man may not offer his lamb? Under the former dispensation Jehovah for wise purposes, enjoined circumcision and sacrificial worship. But the object for which they were instituted is accomplished, and the dispensation under which they were appointed is 'done away' and now 'circumcision' (as an external rite) 'is nothing.' And for sacrifice, the Christian is required to present not a *lamb* but 'his body a living sacrifice to God.' But our author will say perhaps, 'you have proceeded thus far with your lamb very well but you must now stop; for one important fact you have overlooked. "My child is a rational immortal being

and your lamb is nothing but an animal.' Well, so adult sinners and holy angels are rational and immortal being, but they are not fit subjects for baptism; because God never required angels, nor unbelievers, nor speechless babes nor lambs to be baptized. Besides, a lamb is just as capable of receiving benefit from the sprinkling of a few drops of water in its face, as a child; and to me the ceremony would be quite as significant and appropriate in one case as in the other.—Indeed I think I can produce as good reasons from the Bible and from common sense for the baptism of lambs, as he can for the baptism of his babes; and in doing it, I will engage to use as much and as *good* logic, as he has in his third and fourth lectures.

Where shall we go to learn whether the child of a believer may be baptized or not, since the Bible is entirely silent on the subject? Shall we presume to offer up our children in baptism, when God has no where required this service at our hands?

After looking over his last two lectures, I am sorry to be constrained by a sense of duty to say, that there are things on every page which I cannot approve. But as many of the fanciful speculations, and misapplications of scripture, and strong but unfounded assertions, and much of the reasoning on false principles, need not be examined and refuted, in order to a correct understanding of *baptism*; and as I do not like to contradict any man unnecessarily, I shall pass many things which might easily be proved unsubstantial and incorrect, and notice his general principles; for if these be unsound, his whole theory is baseless and his practice absurd. If his foundation is removed, his whole superstructure will, of course, come down.

Let us try the strength of his foundation. It is a given point that the Bible no where enjoins infant baptism. Says Prof. Woods of Andover, 'it is a plain case that there is no express precept respecting infant baptism in our sacred writings.' Says Prof. Stuart, 'commands, or *plain* and *certain* *examples* relative to it, I do not find.' We have already seen that there is nothing in the history

of the church, for two hundred years after Christ, which favors infant baptism. The whole argument of Mr. F. rests on the ideas—1. That the Jewish church and the gospel church are the same. 2. That the covenant made with Abraham is the covenant made with all believers. 3. That baptism has come in the place of circumcision, and therefore, 4. As the children of Abraham were circumcised, so the children of believers are to be baptized. Now if the premises are true, his inferences are just; but if his premises are false, his whole scheme ‘falls to the ground.’ If the Jewish and the Gospel churches are not the same, and if the covenant made with Abraham is not made with *all* believers under the gospel dispensation, and if baptism has not been substituted for circumcision, then children have no right to baptism; and Mr. F. has labored in vain and spent his strength for nought. If it appears on examination that his first principles are wrong, it cannot be necessary to notice and refute the ingenious but fanciful statements which he has based on false principles.

And now to his first principles we direct our attention. 1. He labors to prove (See p. 62 and onward,) that the gospel church is but a continuation of the Jewish church. There is just truth enough in the statement, the ‘Jewish church and gospel church are the same, to impose on the ignorant and superficial reader.’ But with respect to every thing, which concerns the argument on baptism, the statement is obviously false and absurd. The church established under the ministry of Christ and his apostles, rejected the great body of the Jewish church. Even Mr. F. has told us, p. 45, that on the day of Pentecost the Christian church (that is, the apostles and primitive disciples,) could have no access to the temple!! But why not? Why, because ‘the whole city’ (Scribes and Pharisees especially, who were the leaders of the Jewish church) ‘were opposed to the apostles.’ And yet these churches were the same!!! All the children of Abraham were born members of the Jewish church; but members of the gospel church are ‘born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, but born of God.’ That is, such only are embraced by the constitution of the gospel church, as profess to

have been born again. Was that church which embraced the Scribes and Pharisees, the ‘most cruel, determined, open and malignant enemies of Christ,’ who imbrued their hands in his blood, the same with the Christian church? The Jewish church was *national*, that is, it embraced the whole nation of Israel, whether believers or unbelievers, holy or profane. Is this the same with the gospel church? Is not the gospel church composed of awakened, believing, baptized converts? See Acts ii. I cheerfully admit that many points of similarity may be traced between the ancient Jewish and the gospel church. But after all, their constitutions, their materials, their duties, their government, their officers are entirely different.

The constitution of the Jewish church recognized the membership of carnal persons. It made no distinction between ‘those who were born after the flesh, and those born after the Spirit.’ “There was no law to exclude from the Jewish church the Pharisees, the Sadducees, or even Jeroboam the son of Nebat, who made Israel to sin. They had a right to all the privileges of the ancient church. Their doctrines and practices were condemned by the Old Testament, but it was no corruption of the constitution of the church to retain them. On the other hand, the constitution of the Christian church ‘rejects all such persons, and provides for their expulsion.’ It is a corruption of the church which receives or retains them. The distinction between the two cases is as wide as the distance between earth and heaven.”

The ordinances of the Jewish church are abolished. Christ took away the hand writing of ordinances, nailing it to his cross.—Col. ii: 14–17. Mr. F. will not deny, it is presumed, that circumcision was an ordinance. ‘Whatever similarity there may be imagined to be between the Jewish and New Testament churches, that similarity certainly does not consist in the sameness of their members and ordinances. The first embraced and retained carnal members. The last embraced only spiritual members, by its constitution.’ The ordinances of circumcision and priesthood and sacrifice of the first are done away; and the more simple and glorious institutions of the gospel have been

introduced. But there is nothing in the Bible which justifies the assertion that baptism has taken the place of circumcision, any more than that it has come in the room of priesthood or of sacrifice. This is the only point in which the identity of the gospel and the Jewish churches can have any bearing on the impending question, viz. Who are proper subjects of baptism?

If there is a difference between these two churches with respect to *members* and ordinances, then other points of coincidence can avail Mr. F. nothing in the present argument. I am ready to concede with Mr. Carson, that the church of Israel was a type of the gospel church, containing no doubt the 'body of the people of God at that time on the earth,' and in that point of view may be called the same. And Mr. F. has quoted some passages of scripture which seem to take this view of the subject; but they do not in the least help his argument to prove the rite of infant baptism. His first principle, therefore, is not sustained; it falls to the ground. He says, p. 66, 'The requirements of the gospel are the same as the requirements of the law.' This sentence will not bear inspection. That the great *moral duties* enjoined in the gospel and in the law, are the same, I admit. But we are reasoning not about moral duties, but positive institutions. That the law and the gospel enjoin the same positive rites, is a statement which no discriminating mind can approve. The law required the sacrifice of lambs, goats and doves, and the celebration of various festivals; but who will contend that the gospel enjoins on us these services? Again, same page, 'the rules of discipline are essentially the same.' My reader will himself perceive that this is a mistake, and it would seem to be a needless mistake. Any man with the Bible before him, can easily detect it. I can only say to Mr. F. 'Art thou a master in Israel, and knowest not' the difference between the discipline of the Jewish church and that of the New Testament church? Again, p. 67, 'The Jewish church has been represented as the bride of Christ?' I grant it. And the rock in the wilderness, 'was *Christ*.' But was it Christ in reality or Christ in symbol or emblem? Plainly the latter. If he

should insist that the language in these cases was literal and not figurative, I should conclude that he was on the very confines of the 'Holy Mother Church,' and would soon advocate transubstantiation. It is said on p. 67, 'The case of the apostles proves the identity of the church.' Why? 'During Christ's ministry they were members of the church of Israel. They attended the worship and ordinances of that church.'

'Now were they cut off from one church and formed into another? If so, how and when and by whom was it done?' I might in turn ask when and where and by whom were the 'United Colonies,' cut off from their allegiance to the king of Great Britain, and formed into an independent republic? When did the charter of their king expire? Were they not subjects of the British Crown until they framed and adopted a constitution? Was not their former Charter and their present Constitution much alike? And yet were they not in many respects very dissimilar? But if Mr. F. really wishes to know when the members of the Gospel church were excluded, and by whom it was done; he can take up the New Testament and turn to John ix : 22, 'For the Jews (that is the Jewish church) had agreed already, that if any man did confess, that He (Jesus) was Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue.' Says Henry (*in loco*), 'Here is the late law which the Sanhedrim had made. It was agreed and enacted, by their authority, that if any man within their jurisdiction did confess that Jesus was Christ he should be put out of the synagogue.' Here the crime is specified, viz:—Embracing or confessing Christ as the promised Messiah. The punishment says Henry, was this. 'He shall be deemed and taken as an apostate from the faith of the *Jewish* church, and a rebel and traitor against the government of it, and should therefore be put out of the *synagogue* as one that had rendered himself unworthy of the honors and incapable of the privileges of this church; he should be excommunicated, and expelled the commonwealth of Israel. Nor was this merely an ecclesiastical censure, which a man that made no conscience of their authority, might slight, but it was in effect an *outlawry*

which excluded a man from civil commerce and deprived him of his liberty and property.' Says Doddridge, 'It was a censure which was reckoned very infamous, and attended with many civil incapacities and penalties.' And so say Dr. Gill, and other expositors. Here then is the deliberate and authoritative and permanent decision of the Jewish church, that if any man confessed Christ, he should be excommunicated. It is to be hoped Mr. F. will study the discipline of the Jewish church, before he writes his next book on baptism. And yet he says that this church and the Gospel church is the same church!!!—See also John xii:42, 'Many of the rulers believed on him, but because of the Pharisees they did not confess him, lest they should be put out of the synagogue.' They dreaded this anathema of the Jewish church. They were like some prudent ministers, who dare not advocate openly the cause of eternal truth and justice, in relation to the poor down-trodden slaves, lest they should lose their popularity, and perhaps, be cast out of their synagogue. But this prudence goes by another name in heaven!

Reader, you perceive that so far as it relates to every thing connected with the subject of baptism—the statement that 'the Jewish and gospel churches are the same' is *not based on truth*. Of course the conclusions of Mr. F. are not correct. Page 68, 'The covenant of the Israelitish church (that which God made with Abraham) the *token* of which was applied to children, is still the covenant of the Gospel church.' But why speak of the Israelitish church and the *Gospel* church. Had he forgotten that they are one and the same church? Suppose I should say that these lectures of Mr. Fowler, are still Mr. Fowler's lectures. But I deny this doctrine. The covenant of Abraham is not made with Christians under the Gospel. The passages which he has quoted to prove it are every one of them forced, they do not touch the point at issue. The covenant made with Abraham, as he has correctly quoted it from Gen. xvii:7, 8, reads thus 'And I will establish my covenant between me and thee; and thy seed

after thee, in their generations, for an everlasting covenant to be a God unto thee, and thy seed after thee. And I will give unto thee the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God.' Now has any believer among us, the stupidity or delusion to believe, that this covenant was ever made with him. Has God ever promised to any Christian in Fall River, that he should have a *seed*, a numerous offspring, that Jehovah will be the God of that seed, and that his posterity shall have the land of Canaan for a possession? Every man of candor and common sense, must say *no*. What then does Mr. F. mean when he says that this is the covenant of the Gospel church, of all believers? The fact is, this covenant has no more to do with infant baptism, than the covenant which God made with Noah. We may as well go to the charter of King Charles III. to prove infant baptism, as to the Abrahamic covenant. The sentiments held forth in these lectures are too foolish to refute, were it not that great men write lectures to promulgate them, and men of influence recommend those lectures when they are written!

But Mr. F. claims, page 70, that this covenant is '*everlasting*, and the eternal God will not suffer it to fail.'—In the hands of our Pædobaptist friends, it seems to be an '*ever-elastic covenant*.' It is stretched and contracted at will, to reach the exigencies of every case. But why does the author place so much stress on the term *everlasting*? 'This word has, for one of its meanings, during life; and this definition is as good as the *first* definition of *aionios*.' See p. 117. If he should attempt to prove that *aionios* in this place means 'eternal,' to adopt his own logic and use his own words, 'every man of common sense will turn with disgust from his foolish sophistry.' It were easy to show that his criticisms on that page of his Appendix are slender and superficial; but slender as they are, they are sufficient to hew away his own slender argument in this place. But he insists that 'this covenant was spiritual, and its capital promise was, I will be a God to thee and thy seed after thee.' But will any man insist that Jehovah was their God in a *spiritual sense*? Can any one be-

lieve this, with the history of the Jewish nation spread out before him? Were not the great body of the Jews the most hardened rebels? And has not the wrath of a holy God burned against them? Mr. F. appears to me to have mistaken the nature and design of the Abrahamic covenant. His views are very confused and indistinct on the subject, if we may judge from his writings. At one time he calls this covenant 'the covenant of the Israelitish church'—at another, 'the covenant of the gospel church'—and then, 'the gospel covenant'—and then, a '*spiritual* covenant'—and then, it is the 'covenant of grace'—and the 'covenant of Abraham'—and the 'covenant of all believers.' Now, what an Abrahamic covenant this must be, which is made with almost every body, and includes almost every blessing, but *secures* none! Now, the covenant which God made with Abraham, like every part of the ancient Scriptures, is replete with instruction, and is entitled to our careful study; though it has no possible bearing on the subject of infant baptism. This covenant, like most other things pertaining to that typical economy, had a literal and a spiritual scope. Like the brazen serpent for instance. Its first use was, to heal the bitten and dying Israelites. The second was, to prefigure Christ as lifted up on the cross, to whom the *dying* nations, who have been wounded by the 'old serpent's fang,' may 'look and live.' So the covenant with Abraham. Its leading promise was, that in the *seed* of Abraham 'all the nations of the earth shall be blessed.' For the accomplishment of this *grand promise*, three distinct promises were made to him. 'First, a numerous posterity, which was fulfilled in the letter, in the nation of Israel. It was fulfilled in the spirit, by the divine constitution that makes all believers the children of Abraham. The unbelieving Jews were Abraham's children, as to the flesh; yet there is a sense in which Jesus denies that they were the children of Abraham. The second promise was, to be a God to him and his seed, which was fulfilled in the letter, by his protection of Israel in Egypt—his delivering them from bondage—his taking them into covenant at Sinai—and all his subsequent dealings with them in their generations, till

they were cast off by their rejection of Christ. This promise is fulfilled in the spirit, by God's being a 'God to all believers in a *higher sense* than he was to Israel.'—Rom. iv : 11, 12. Jer. xxxi : 33. The third promise was, of the land of Canaan, fulfilled in the letter to Israel, and in the spirit fulfilled to the true Israel, in the possession of the heavenly inheritance."

With this view of the subject, I believe all the Old and New Testament accounts of that covenant will agree.—The covenant of Abraham is extremely interesting to me, but I want the *substance* and not the *shadow*. I should like to occupy several pages in considering this covenant, and examining and explaining the misappropriated but precious texts which speak of it; but as it is not necessary in this place, and I have no room to spare, for the present, I waive it. *We*, as Gentiles, certainly are not interested in the temporal blessings of that covenant. We are not literally the children of Abraham. To be the spiritual children of Abraham, and receive the spiritual blessings of the covenant, we must be *believers*; for in no other sense can we be the children of Abraham. Till our children become believers in Christ, they have no more interest in the covenant made with Abraham than they have in the covenant which God made with Jacob; and it is perfect folly to go to that covenant for authority to baptize them. If Mr. F. could prove that all the children in his Sabbath school were the literal children of Abraham, (and he might as well prove that, as some things which he has attempted to prove, and I doubt not he might make many of his hearers believe it;) they would have no right on that ground to baptism. The language of the New Testament sounds in his ear, 'Bring forth fruits meet for repentance, and begin not to say, we have Abraham to our father.' The third chapter of Matthew spoils his whole theory.

But it is said, p. 71, that 'baptism is substituted in the place of circumcision.' This is mere assertion. There is not a text in the Bible which either declares or implies any such thing. The only passage which he has quoted in proof, is Col. ii : 11, 12, which reads thus, "In whom

also ye are circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh by the circumcision of Christ: *Buried with him in baptism*, wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead." What is there in this interesting text to prove directly or indirectly, literally or spiritually, positively or probably, that infants are subjects of baptism; or that baptism has come in the place of circumcision? Yet Mr. F., after quoting a part of both these texts, and altering their punctuation by substituting a period for a comma, and a colon for a semicolon, has the recklessness or hardihood (I say not which) to declare that, here the apostle calls baptism the circumcision of Christ, or the Christian circumcision, obviously teaching us that it stands in the place of circumcision!!! A more baseless assertion cannot be found in the Alcoran of Mahomet! These Colossians were Gentiles; but they had received that 'circumcision which is of the heart in the spirit and not in the letter,' and as an emblematical profession of the *fact* that they were thus circumcised and interested in Christ, they had been 'buried with him in baptism,' and in which, to use the comment of Macknight, a Pædobaptist, 'Ye have been raised with him out of the water as persons made spiritually alive through your belief of the strong working of God, who raised him from the dead.' But why talk about the law of circumcision, when discussing the subject of baptism? That law was never binding on any nation but the Jews. Is the law of circumcision binding on us? Then we are bound to practice circumcision according to that law, and circumcise our *male* children at eight days old. If the law of circumcision be abolished, (which Mr. F. admits, p. 71,) then we can obtain no authority to baptize children from a law which is annulled. The design and the subjects of the two ordinances are totally dissimilar. The law of circumcision required that Hebrew *male* children and *servants* should be circumcised. The law of baptism requires that *believers*, whether male or female, old or young, among all nations, should be baptized.

Thus, after a brief examination, we perceive that the

Jewish church and the gospel church are not the same—that the Abrahamic covenant is not made with all believers, and baptism is not the appointed substitute for circumcision. And hence it is evident that Mr. Fowler's theory rests not on 'solid rock,' but on a mouldering, unsubstantial basis. I have objections to his method of reasoning. For instance: 1. He proves that the Jewish church is the same as the gospel church. How? By supremely positive assertion. 2. He proves that the 'covenant' of these two churches is the same, because the church is the same church. And, thirdly, he reasons that the rite of baptism has come in the place of circumcision surely, because the Jewish church and the gospel church are the same, and the covenant in both churches is the same! A man who is expert at the business, can easily turn off a great many such arguments in the course of twenty-four hours, and have some time left for refreshment and repose. But I can only say that my conscience, stupid as it is, would not permit me to slumber refreshingly, after palming such sophistry in the plain and interesting and momentous things of God upon the public, while they look to me as a minister of Jesus to instruct them in the duties of religion. If it be lawful to prove one thing by positive assertion, and then prove a second thing by that assumed fact, and by these two assumed facts prove a third, and these three give birth to another monstrous argument—what, I ask, may not be proved?

I will notice a few among many contradictions in his 3d lecture. Page 71, he tells us that Jeremiah foretold a time when the Jews, (that is the Jewish church) would be 'incorporated with the Gospel church.' And then in the next sentence tells us that the 'church has been the same under both dispensations.' There was a time therefore when the church became incorporated with the church!! Page 73 He intimates that Christ would not expressly enjoin the baptism or the dedication of infants, because it had been expressly enjoined already, and was well understood and practiced generally. And anon, he tells us that Christ has expressly enjoined the baptism of

infants in his commission. That is, a commission to baptized *believers*, includes speechless babes !!

And again these believers who understood, and practiced infant dedication generally, did not understand any thing about this business, and when the 'children were brought to Christ the very *disciples* rebuked those who brought them, and Christ had to teach them that 'little children' were to be received as formerly! The reader can 'put that and that together' without my help.

Circumcision according to Mr. F. is 1. 'A token of the dedication of children to God.' 2. 'A token of the covenant made with Abraham.' 3. 'A *seal* of the covenant.' 4. 'A token of covenant relation.' 5. 'An instituted prerequisite to a connexion with the church.'—6. 'A sign representing *regeneration*.' 7. 'A seal of the *covenant of grace*'!!! His language is 'As a seal circumcision confirmed the righteousness of faith, or the covenant of grace!! Baptism does the same!' Now I cannot understand a writer, who will make use of such ambiguous, bewildering, contradictory language. It seems there are about as many uses to the rite of circumcision, as there are meanings to baptizo. I am pained at my very heart, to think that men of sense, and learning, and piety, will be so blinded by prejudice, for a favorite practice, as to mangle and misapply the word of God, and violate the rules of logic, and the laws of philology, in order to carry their points. 'Circumcision confirmed the righteousness of faith, or the covenant of grace.' What does he mean? Does he mean that the righteousness of faith, and the covenant of grace, are the same thing? Or does he mean that circumcision and baptism confirm one of the two different things, just as any man pleases to have them?—But the ideas are unscriptural and insipid. 'Circumcision confirms the covenant of grace!! 'Baptism does the same!' Neither the one nor the other was ever the confirmatory seal of the covenant of grace. The covenant of grace is confirmed by the oath and promise of the eternal God, and sealed by the blood of Christ. And Christians are sealed not by baptism, but by the 'Holy Spirit unto the day of redemption.' As well might he say, that every time he

sprinkles an unknowing babe, he seals and confirms the constitution of the United States.

Again he tells us, p. 70, that ‘this covenant, (the covenant of Abraham, but which is made with every body that is a Christian, or has a Christian father, or mother,) being the only covenant of grace which God has ever made with men, the *terms* and *extent* of it must continue as they were originally, unless they are revoked or modified by their author. This he has never done.’ Now observe, 1. Circumcision he says, ‘was an instituted prerequisite to a connexion with the Jewish church.’ Of course, Jewish females had no connexion *with* nor privileges *in* the church. This is not true, but this is his argument. The fact is, all the descendants of Abraham, whether males or females, were born into the church, and entitled to all its privileges, unless, in case of the male children, the covenant was broken by a neglect of their circumcision. But he reasons thus—the *terms* and *extent* of the covenant, were, that all who were circumcised, were brought into a connexion with the church. The females were of course excluded.—2. The ‘*terms* and *extent* of the covenant must continue as they were originally, unless, they are revoked or modified by their author.’ 3. ‘This he has never done.’ 4. ‘God has modified the ‘*terms* and *extent* of the covenant,’ so as to take in females and leave out servants, and has substituted baptism for circumcision! Is it possible that such a theological giant as Mr. Fowler, will reason in this way, and contradict himself on every page? But error will be crooked.

On p. 74, then after repeating his text, go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptizing them, &c., he adds, ‘the word rendered teach, (*Matheteusate*) properly signifies as every Greek scholar knows, and as commentators agree, *make disciples, proselyte, or bring over* to the Christian religion.” Here is one sentence which I heartily approve. This teaching must, according to the text, and according to Mr. F. himself, *precede* baptism. This teaching is *making* disciples, *proselyting*, or *bringing* over to the Christian religion.’ This is good Baptist or Bible doctrine, and it excludes little infants to all intents and purposes:—

for every one knows whether he be a Greek scholar or not, that such little unconscisus and unknowing babes, cannot be taught, nor made disciples.

How in the world can we proselyte a babe? Bring over (by means of teaching,) a *babe* to the Christian religion! What an absurdity? But he adds, 'The commission is this, 'Go ye and make proselytes or disciples of all nations (both adults and children,) baptizing them, &c.' Some *children* at an early period may be taught, may exercise repentance towards God, and faith in our Lord Jesus Christ, and give good evidence of piety. All such ought of course to be baptized according to the commission. But he does not mean such, for he adds, 'nations is a collective term including both,' that is adults and little children. If he takes the word in this unlimited sense, he is very wicked to exclude the children of all nations, unless they have the good fortune to be born of pious parents. The children of *unbelievers* are as much included as the children of believers.

How plain and easy to be understood is this commission, 'Go teach and baptize.' 'He that believeth and is baptized.' But the term *nations* includes *all*, little new-born infants even. Let us try this rule, 'My house shall be called an house of prayer for all nations.' Who shall forbid infants of three weeks old, and a span long, the use of their chapel in which they meet to offer up prayer to God! This house is for all nations, and that term includes the dear little creatures! 'Shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?' But would God take vengeance on little infants, as they slumbered in their cradles, because their ungodly fathers provoked him to anger? Yes, according to this law of interpretation, the term includes all the infants. 'Declare his marvellous work among *all nations*. Will Mr. F. do his duty and declare the marvellous works of God to the little sucklings in his Parish?—His direction is to do this, yea according to his own statement he must teach the little nurslings thoroughly and efficiently and 'bring them over to the Christian religion,' before he baptizes them! I do wish that he and his people might see the inaccuracy of their reasoning and ab-

surdity of their practice on this point, I certainly feel no hostility toward *them*, but I feel bound by truth and duty to bear my testimony against the baptizing of babes, and against the arguments they bring in support of that practice.

I hope they will review the subject, with a desire to know the truth as it is in Jesus. Christians 'shall be hated of all nations.' But do little children, while hanging on the bosoms of their mothers, *hate Christians?*

On p. 76 it is said that 'the apostles never taught nor *hinted* that this practice (circumcision) which had so long prevailed by God's express command, was now under the gospel, to be abolished'! I reply, 1st. He has said on p. 71, that circumcision is abolished and baptism is established in the same church. 2d. Paul declared, while writing to Gentile Christians, that Christ hath blotted out the hand-writing of Jewish ordinances, which was against them, nailing it to the cross. Col. ii : 14. Our Pædobaptist expositor, Dr. Doddridge, paraphrases the text thus: 'Having blotted out with respect to us the hand-writing of Jewish ordinances and institutions, which was contrary to us, (Acts xv. 10) and had an evident efficacy either to load us with a heavy burden, or to alienate the hearts of our Jewish brethren from us; and therefore he hath taken it away from between us, as I may so express it, nailing it to his cross, and thereby has cancelled it, as bonds are cancelled by being struck through with a nail; while he has accomplished the purposes of the ceremonial law by that sacrifice of himself, and thereby caused the obligation of it to cease.'

Hear the apostle, Gal. v : 1, 2, 3; 'Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage.' But what was this yoke of bondage? 'Behold I Paul say unto you that if ye be *circumcised*, Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole law.' Was not the apostle here remonstrating with his Gal-

atian brethren against their attachment to circumcision and the rites of the Jewish law? Does he not plainly imply that circumcision was not obligatory upon them? And that it was not only wicked but foolish to barter away the liberty which Christ had given them, for the bondage of circumcision, and the rituals of Moses' law? Does he not say, that 'circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing. As many as desire to make a fair show in the flesh, *they* constrain you to be circumcised.'—Is here no '*hint*' that circumcision was abolished? Again see Acts xv. here we learn that difficulty arose in the Apostolic church, 'For certain men came down from Judea,' (sticklers for the Abrahamic covenant,) 'and taught the people that unless they were circumcised after the manner of Moses, they could not be saved.' The result was, that an ecclesiastical council was called at Jerusalem, consisting of the 'apostles and elders and brethren, to consider this matter.' And if Mr. F. had examined the records of that council, as attentively as he did those of the council of Carthage in the 3d century, consisting of sixty-six ignorant African clergymen, with Cyprian for their president, he would not have told the Christian public that 'the apostles *never*, under any circumstances, nor in any form, taught nor hinted that *circumcision was* abolished under the gospel.' Mr. F. considers that circumcision was a privilege, and talks about the 'enlargement of privilege' under the gospel. The apostles considered that rite a burden or a 'yoke which neither we, nor our fathers were able to bear.'

They pointedly disapproved of those teachers who taught the necessity or use of circumcision, liberated their brethren from all obligation to observe that bloody rite, and on that memorable occasion, when they would have done it, if ever, they say not one word about baptism as its substitute. If the one was a substitute for the other, they had only to say in a word, 'brethren, you need not contend about the continuance or discontinuance of circumcision, for baptism has come in its room under the gospel.' This would have satisfied all parties, the Gentiles would not have complained, and the Jews would have

been pleased, but the idea was never dreamed of by the apostles. At least, they taught no such doctrine; and, hence, it is morally certain as they gave no such intimation at that time, when called together for the special purpose of discussing the subject, and healing some divisions which had taken place on account of it, that baptism was never intended as a substitute of the other. I leave my reader to judge between these inspired apostles and Mr. Fowler, who dissents from them with regard to the nature, design, use, and abolishment of circumcision.

Mr. F. appeals to the ‘instructions given by Christ united with his treatment of little children,’ to prove their right to baptism. This is strange. And as Jesus never baptized a little child, nor ever gave any instructions at all about the baptism of children, I shall not follow Mr. F. in his ingenious but altogether fanciful speculations, on that topic. I am sorry that he should make the *rash* and unfounded assertion that “Christ often spoke of the practice (the dedication of little children to God,) with implied approbation.” And I still more regret that he should force two or three passages out of their plain obvious meaning, in order to brace an assertion so perfectly idle and baseless. Strange that the conversion of Zaccheus, and the fact that little children were brought to Christ that “he should ‘touch them’ or put his hand on them and pray,” should be *quoted as arguments* for infant baptism.

But then it seems, p. 75, 6 & 7, &c., that we must hear the instruction and notice *the practice* of the apostles on this subject. The apostles did no more and said no more about the baptism of babes, than they did about the baptism of meeting-house bells. But we will just notice a passage or two from the New Testament, which he has endeavored to press into the service of infant baptism.—The first is in Acts ii, ‘For the promise is to you and to your children, and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord our God shall call.’ He thinks this promise was the promise made to Abraham! This idea appears to me altogether unreasonable, unsupported, and absurd.—Nothing had been said about that covenant. And again,

* I wish the reader would turn to Luke xix. and see what there is in the first ten verses to justify infant baptism.

I do not admire the dexterity with which he turns the 'covenant' into 'the *promise*,' for his own accommodation. The *promise* was undoubtedly that great promise or prediction in Joel, with which the apostles commenced.—See Acts ii : 17. Which he had been illustrating, and was now improving. 'But' says Mr. F., 'it was a promise that runs to parents and their children.' Yes, but had he forgotten that it was a promise 'that runs to parents, their children, and to all that are afar off'? To how many of these parents and children, and all that are afar off? Why—to 'as many as the Lord our God shall call.' Neither this passage nor this promise has any thing more to do with the covenant of Abraham, than it has with the constitution of the United States. And we might as well found infant baptism on the one as the other.

That this promise referred to the promise of the Holy Ghost, is the opinion of 'Dr. Doddridge, Dr. Owen, Dr. Hammond, Dr. Whitby, Witsius, Venema and Limborch.' The promise did not regard little infants, but their children, that is, their posterity. Sucklings were not intended, because God never 'calls' such in the sense of the word *call* in the text. And the promise runs parallel with the call, 'even as many as the Lord our God shall call.' The passage is very plain, and it seems strange to me that any man of an enlightened mind and a good conscience can adduce the baptism of infants from it. It looks to me like 'wresting the Scriptures.' If the infant children of the Jews have *as such* a right to the promise, and therefore to baptism, it follows irresistibly on the very same principle, that all the heathen ('them that are afar off,') have a right also in their state of idolatry, for this promise belongs as much to one as the other. Our Pædobaptist missionaries will find plenty of business on this plan. Go teach and baptize the nations—that is, baptize little children without teaching, 'for they are a part of all nations.' Go baptize them all—yes, *all*—for the promise is to all, 'even them that are afar off.' Let our Pædobaptist friends carry out their sentiments into action, or else thinking men will be apt to suspect that they do not believe their own declarations! It surely will not be contended that the promise referred to in the above text meant the spiritual

blessings included in the covenant of Abraham. And if it be said 'that the promise belongs not to his *natural* but his *spiritual* seed,' this will not help Mr. F. at all; for it is only they 'which are of *faith*' that are in this sense the 'children of Abram.' Our children have no more actual interest in those blessings promised to faith until they become *believers* in Christ, than have the Hottentôts of Africa. There is but one way more that ingenuity can devise to bring the children of believers into that covenant and interest them in its blessings. That is, to make the 'promise run' to believers, the spiritual seed of Abraham, and to their carnal seed or literal offspring. This would do well enough, if it were not for one single difficulty in the way. The Bible pulls up by the roots this ingenious theory. 'He saith not to *seeds* as of many, (spiritual and carnal) but as of *one*, and to thy seed which is Christ.'—Gal. iii : 16. 'And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's *seed*, and heirs according to promise.' v. 29. It must be evident to every attentive reader that Mr. F. has mistaken and misapplied the 'promise' in the text which we have considered. Next we are referred to 1 Cor. vii : 14, for proof that infants are to be baptized. 'For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife, and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the husband; else were your children unclean, but now are they holy.'

1. It is quite evident to me that Mr. F. and the several men on whom he leans for support in this case, great as they are, have entirely overlooked the scope of the Apostle in this place. I can easily balance books with him, by producing the same kind of authority to destroy his interpretation of this passage. To begin—his interpretation is just 310 years old. Zuinglas, in A. D. 1525, boasted the honor of discovering this *new* way of defending infant baptism, on the 'ground of federal holiness.' Whereas, Ambrose of Milan, in the fourth century said, concerning this passage, 'The children are holy, because born of lawful wedlock.' In this opinion agree Jerome, Erasmus, Camerarius, Macknight and Musculus and many others. Musculus says, 'Formerly I have abused this plan against the Anabaptists, thinking the meaning was, that the chil-

dren were holy for the parents' faith; which, though true, the place makes nothing for the purpose: and I hope, that upon reading this, every one that has abused it to such a purpose will make the like acknowledgment; I am sure they ought.' But let us look at this subject for ourselves, and not depend on some great man, who was swayed perhaps by sectarian prejudice, and like Sampson in the prison-house, with both his eyes put out, was prepared to make sport for the Philistines, instead of writing sound divinity.

1. Not one word is said about infant baptism, nor baptism itself, in the whole chapter. This is enough to destroy all Mr. F.'s arguments on the passage. 2. His interpretation is absurd in itself. The holiness of the children in this place, arose from the sanctification of the parents to each other. And on *his* ground the unbelieving wife was sanctified (made holy) by the believing husband.—Why, then, does he not on his principle receive to baptism and church-fellowship the *unbelieving* but *holy* companion, as well as the *child*? I would ask Mr. F., and I want a definite answer, how much holier are the unbelieving wife and the carnal babe of a *Christian* man, than the unbelieving wife and carnal babe of an *unconverted* man.

Again, the holiness of the child and its right to baptism, in the estimation of Mr. F., arise from the *faith* of one of the parents. But the holiness of which Paul spake, results from the sanctification of the parents to each other in the compact of marriage. On Mr. F.'s plan, since the child is entitled to baptism on account of the faith of one of its parents, should an unmarried female member of his church give birth to a child, if he excluded the mother he would be under the necessity of baptizing the child, because it would be 'the child of a visible believer'! But the apostle says, these parents are sanctified to each other, 'else were your children unclean, but now are they holy.' The holiness of the child certainly is the consequence of connubial sanctification. Now what kind of holiness is that which belongs to children in consequence of the lawful marriage of their parents? It is plain that his view of the

text will not bear the test of examination. What, then, is the plain import of this passage? To understand a writer, we must look at the object he has in view—ascertain the subject which he is discussing—the point which he is proving, or the question he is answering. Paul in this chapter was responding to some questions which had been proposed for his solution by the church at Corinth. The Jews reckoned that all marriageable persons violated the law of heaven—*multiply and replenish the earth*—unless they entered into the conjugal state. Judaizing teachers therefore warmly recommended marriage. But the Grecian philosophers affirmed, if a man would be happy he should not marry. Some of the Pythagorians represented marriage as inconsistent with purity. These conflicting opinions involved the Corinthian church in trouble. The Judaizing teachers and their own natural inclinations urged them on to marriage; while the doctrine of Grecian philosophy and the inconveniences attending marriage, in those days of persecution and peril, led them to a contrary course. In this state of things, it would seem they judged it expedient to write to the apostle and request an answer (that is, so far as we may judge from the answer itself,) to three queries. 1. Whether it were not best to abstain from marriage altogether. To which he replied substantially, that in the present distressing times, if they could live chastely and contentedly in an unmarried state, it would be well to remain unmarried; but if they could not, they were bound to marry and avoid temptations to lewdness. He then explained to them the duties of married persons, as established by the law of God. 2. Shall not those already married, separate from each other? And. 3. Where one party has become a Christian and the other remains in unbelief, ought they not to separate?—Perhaps they had their eye upon the law which forbade the Jews to intermingle in marriage with other nations, and also upon the fact that the Jews after their return from Babylon put away their idolatrous wives, and the children which were born of them. See Ezra x : 3. Paul replies—1. To the cases of marriage where both parties were Chris-

tians. The reader can examine the direction of the apostle for himself. 2. The cases where one party had become a Christian and the other remained impenitent : these he directed to live together if the unbelieving companion was willing so to do ; because neither faith nor unbelief could dissolve marriage, and because the believing companion might be the means of saving the unbelieving partner, and especially because ‘the unbelieving husband is sanctified by (to) the wife, &c., else were your children unclean, but now are they holy.’ That is, they are born within the bounds of lawful wedlock and are ‘holy’ in view of the law which regulates the institution of marriage. Dr. Gill has clearly shown that the terms sanctification and holiness are used in this sense among Jewish writers in instances almost innumerable.

This is plainly the argument of the Apostle ; and whoever will read the chapter with a desire to learn truth, instead of inquiring what some interested Rabbi, who had a purpose to serve, has said on the subject, he cannot fail to see that Paul has here not the most distant allusion to baptism. He does not even name baptism, nor do his remarks involve it. As well might Mr. F. have referred us to his sermon preached on Mars Hill, for proof that infants are subjects of baptism, as the passage under examination. We are told about ‘*federal* holiness,’ or *relative* holiness, under the gospel—but I have never yet found a man that could define it. It is a *non-descript*. The unbelieving companion is as holy as the children, according to the text. And if the children are subjects of baptism on account of this ‘holiness’, surely the unbelieving partner should be baptized, and the elder impenitent children as well as the youngest. On what New Testament law does he found the distinction between children of Christians and the children of other men? Must the poor children born of irreligious parents suffer for the sins of their parents? ‘The fathers have eaten sour grapes’, and it seems that Mr. F., contrary to the Bible, insists that the ‘children’s teeth are set on an edge.’ Here the children of believers are *holy* and they must be baptized.

On page 103, he says, 'This ordinance teaches us that children are *depraved*. * * Your children are *polluted*—they are *depraved* from their birth'. Charming consistency!

CHAPTER XIV.

HOUSEHOLD BAPTISM.

MR. F. page 79, adverts to household baptism to prove that infants are to be baptized. He says, 'Let us now examine the practice of the Apostles. Did they baptize the children of believers?' I answer, no—not unless they were believing children, and if so, they were baptized, whether their parents were believers or unbelievers. They did not baptize speechless, unbelieving babes; because, 1. They never received any direction to baptize them. Their commission authorized the baptism of believers only. We have no intimation in the Bible that they ever baptized a child on the faith of its parents. In all the accounts of household baptism, we have as good evidence that the members of those households were believers as we have that they were baptized. It is plainly attested that the household of Crispus believed. Concerning that of the jailor, it is declared that Paul and Silas spake the word to *all* that were in his house, and after he and all his were baptized, 'he rejoiced, *believing* in God, with all his house.' The household of Stephanus 'addicted themselves to the ministry of the saints', and to them Paul exhorted the brethren to 'submit themselves'. Can obstinacy itself believe that any of these were little babes? With respect to Lydia's children, I should think it best to show in the first place that she had children before we baptize them. I believe she had no children—for 1. None are mentioned. 2. She was a merchantress, and was probably an unmarried lady—for if she had a husband, it would have been most natural for him to go to Phillippi to sell the purple, and not to send his wife. 3. If she had a husband she might not have had any children. But if she had a husband and children, it is most likely that when she crossed the *Ægean* sea, a distance of three hundred miles, on a trading voyage, she left her children at home with her husband. 5. We are told

with sufficient definiteness, in the last part of the chapter, who were her household. 'They were *brethren* (probably men-servants) whom Paul comforted before he left the city.' Her household, then, were *brethren* capable of receiving consolation. But Mr. F. says, page 80, 'whether there were infants, or servants, or both in the family, is wholly immaterial; the account represents her family as baptized on her faith, and this establishes the doctrine under consideration'! If he believes his own statement, and reverences the example, why does he not demean himself accordingly, and baptize forthwith all the children, old and young, and all the servants, black and white, which belong to believers through his congregation? All along until now he has insisted that *little children of believers* only were to be baptized—*now*, all at once, by a strange and rapid transition he arrives at the conclusion, which says, if a southern planter should be brought to exercise faith in Christ, if he own three hundred negroes, they must all be baptized on his faith!! I know not where to look for him in his next treatise on baptism. He says 'it is *certain* that Lydia alone believed.' Then the brethren who were comforted by the Apostles were *unbelievers*! But he thinks that if 'they had believed, the writer would have mentioned it.' No, this was not at all necessary, because they baptized none in that day but believers, pursuant to their commission; and when their baptism was mentioned, their faith, or at least a profession of faith, was always implied. Baptist churches now, in making their returns to the Associations with which they are connected, mention the number received by baptism, without saying that every one of them believed. This is not necessary, for every body knows that the Baptists receive none into their fellowship by baptism but professed believers. If an account, couched in the same language precisely as that of Lydia's household in Acts xvi, should be sent from a Baptist church to the Warren Association at its next session, Mr. F. himself would know better than to say that this household were all baptized on the faith of one individual, because this is contrary to Baptist usage.

The primitive Christians were all Baptists, so far as the rite of baptism is concerned, and therefore the baptism of Lydia's household necessarily involved a profession of faith. Mr. F. thinks that 'the opposers of infant baptism cannot resist the argument so clear and conclusive as this case presents', and often insinuates that his arguments have quite non-plussed the poor Baptists. I would only say to him 'do thyself no harm, we are all here.' And perhaps by the time he has presented to the public another edition or two of his astounding arguments, he and this community will know how seriously he has crippled us.

In his remarks about the baptism of the jailor's household, are one or two things which it may be well to notice. He says, 'this believing and *rejoicing* refer to the jailor only.' In the next breath he says, that 'the word rendered *with all his house*, stands with and qualifies the verb *rejoiced*.' As here is a direct contradiction, which assertion shall we believe? 2. Why did the household or the family rejoice? Was it because they were unbelievers, exposed to the wrath of God? He says, 'there was good reason for the jailor to rejoice in connexion with his family; for this connexion with them was such that the Apostle could say, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved and thy house.' Is it a fact that a New England Divine of the nineteenth century intends deliberately and seriously to palm the doctrine on this enlightened community that the jailor's children, or any other man's children, are saved by *parental* faith? If he does not mean this, I ask what does he mean? He says, 'this connexion between believers and their children is eminently favorable to their salvation.' But the Apostle says, 'believe and *thou* shalt be saved, and thy house'—that is, if thy house *believe*, they shall be saved. Salvation is never promised to any but believers. Are there two ways in which men as moral agents can be saved? One by personal faith, and the other by the faith of pious parents? May we have our choice to obey God *personally* or by *proxy*? Infants, as such, are not saved by the

gospel ; they cannot understand nor believe the gospel. They can be saved by the blood of Christ, but they cannot be saved by the gospel as adults are saved. But why introduce children here ? The household of the jailor were not infants ; because they heard the gospel, they believed, they rejoiced, they were baptized, they were saved. If children are saved by the faith of their parents, then who can be lost ? Was not Noah a believer ? On this plan all will be saved who have descended from him by ordinary generation. I wish to have the world know that I have no fellowship for this theology. I consider it dishonorable to God, and unprofitable to men, and dangerous to children. We desire that our children may be saved ; we love their immortal souls, and we would not for the world insinuate that they can be saved by our faith. Much as we love them, and ardently as we desire their salvation, we are bound to tell them that they, like other children, are sinners against God, and must repent or perish—that unless they believe they must be damned. Our faith cannot save them—Abraham's covenant cannot save them—baptism cannot save them. Nothing but personal holiness can prepare them for heaven. I have not the least doubt but that the doctrine taught on this subject in these lectures, while it has tended to secularize the church, has multiplied hypocrites and formal professors, led many to think they were ' something (in the Abrahamic covenant) when they were nothing', and ruined thousands of immortal souls !! If Mr. F. simply means to say that piety in parents will secure the instruction of children, and thus their children be more likely to be saved, to this statement we will not object. But what has this to do with infant baptism ? Religious instruction is one thing—the baptism of an infant, which knows not its right hand from its left, is quite another thing.

Again, he is not satisfied with our translation. He gives us what he calls an ' exact, literal translation' of this passage. But he says p. 34, ' But the translators of the Bible were neither *ignorant* nor *wicked* men. They *knew* and *did* their duty.' Was it modest in Mr. F. to oppose such men, murmur against their translation, and

give a better, a more exact one? But I wish the reader to have all the benefit of his 'literal and exact' translation. It is this: (*Egalliasato pansiki pepisteukos to Theo,*) 'and he rejoiced with all his house, *he having believed in God.*' Every Greek scholar he thinks 'knows' that this is correct. I leave all unbiassed Greek scholars to determine whether he has not given us a clumsy translation; and whether the following version, is not quite as 'exact and literal' as the above: 'He rejoiced with all the house believing in God.' Those who have no acquaintance with the Greek, may be perfectly satisfied with our version. The word of God was spoken to the jailer, and *all* that were in his house, and he, and *all* his house, as I understand it, believed, and rejoiced together. They were a happy family!! I know of a similar family in Rhode Island, who, within a year, 'went down into the water,' and were all baptized on a profession of faith. The household included, (if I do not misremember) the father and mother, three children, and two servants. I have known several such instances.

Mr. F. has made, p. 48, a number of positive but altogether unsupported and absurd assertions, about the manner in which this household were baptized. He says they were affused in the outer-prison. I conclude that they were immersed; for, 1. The word used, signifies immersion. 2. Immersion was the uniform practice of the apostles. 3. They were not baptized in the jail, ('he brought them out,') nor in the house, for after baptism they were 'brought into the house.' But why leave the house, to sprinkle a few drops of water on the faces of these candidates? But where were this believing, rejoicing family immersed? It is not necessary for us to know, if it had been, the Holy Spirit would have told us. Probably, in a tank or bath in the jail-yard. Mr. F. affects to despise this idea, as unworthy of notice. 'It is too far fetched to merit a serious consideration.' But it is foolish in any man to deny facts or reason against them. A tank or a bathing place, is now, and ever has been, a common and necessary appendage of an eastern prison. Says our Burman missionary, Judson, while addressing his brethren

in view of this objection, 'this case can present no difficulty to the minds of any of you, my brethren, who may have been within the yard of the prison, in this city, (Calcutta) or are acquainted with the fact, that *prison yards* in the east, as well as the yards and gardens of private houses, are usually furnished with tanks of water.' See Judson's, ser. p. 11. Take Mr. F. on his own ground a moment. He says without any authority but his own, *ipse dixit*, that the jailor brought them not *out* of prison, but out of the *inner* to the *outer prison*, 'here the preaching, the washing the stripes, &c. were done.' Well then, 'they spake the word to *all* that were *in his house*,' that is, they called up at the midnight hour, the family, *babes* and all, that they might go to jail, and hear the gospel preached to *all* that were in the *Jailor's house*!!! I am not pleased with his views; I believe the time is coming when he will not like them himself. Thus it appears that sprinkling for baptism has no support, from the meaning of the word, nor from the Bible, nor from ecclesiastical history for several hundred years after Christ. Infant baptism has no support from the scriptures. The Bible no where enjoins it. The apostles never practiced it. The great commission does not embrace it; the Abrahamic covenant has nothing to do with it; the decision of Paul regulating the duties of married believers at Corinth, does not touch it. The history of the church in the first two centuries does not recognize it, and it is altogether a worse than useless invention of man, and was never enforced by any authority superior to that of African councils, and the Pope of Rome. It must, and will finally go into disuse, and the sooner it goes to the shades the better. The time will come, when American Christians will look back with as much astonishment at the foolish, unmeaning, and unscriptural ceremony of infant sprinkling, as they do now at infant communion, transubstantiation, exorcism, consecration of baptismal water, baptism of meeting-house bells, and baptism of the dead! For all of these have in their turn been as valuable, as sacred, and as well founded on the Bible, in the opinion of many, as infant baptism is now! And it is my honest conviction that the last has injured the

church of Christ on earth, more seriously, done more to mar her beauty, and destroy her peace, than all the rest. Its direct tendency is to build up a national establishment, secularize the church, and remove Jehovah's own boundary line, between believers and unbelievers, by putting the badge of Christianity on unconverted, *carnal*, speechless infants.

On p. 92, Mr. Fowler commences his fourth lecture. On this lecture, I need not say much, as my examination has already involved almost every thing which it contains. Under the head of objections to infant baptism, which he attempts to refute, two or three things only are deemed worthy of notice. 1. He reasons that we have as good authority to baptize little children, as we have to devote the first day of the week to devotional purposes. But this is not correct; we have the plain example of the apostles for the observance of that day, but we have not the example of the apostles for infant baptism. Mr. F. may claim that he has apostolic example, but there is no such thing; he has not produced—he cannot produce a solitary instance of infant baptism by the apostles. The comparison therefore is altogether absurd—the cases are not parallel.

Another declaration, p. 94, equally destitute of propriety and force, is, that ‘the command to observe the Lord's supper, was given only to men.’ The fact is, that women were baptized as well as men, and had a right, from the nature of the case, to both ordinances. Women are responsible moral agents, but babes are not. Women, as Mary, the mother of our Lord, and others, belonged to the church at Jerusalem, and they (the church) continued with one accord, in breaking of bread, &c. There we have examples for female communion. If the Bible had only said they were baptized, men, women, and infants, and were added to the church, and then, that the church communed—why, in that case, we could make infant baptism, and infant communion, but the Bible does not read thus. Besides, ‘let every *man* examine himself, let him eat of that bread,’ &c. The original word *Anthropos* is used in both genders, and signifies equally man and wo-

man; and therefore, we have a precept for female communion. Moral and religious duties are enjoined upon women, as much as men—but conscientious *duties* involving moral agency and including religious privilege are never required of unconscious babes. Mr. F.'s remarks in this place appear to me to be forceless.

Again he says, 'faith is no where required of infants in order to any privilege.' Well, what of that? Faith is no where required of a sheep in order to any privilege. But does that prove that a sheep is a subject of baptism? The argument is worth just as much in the one case as in the other. Again, 'if infants cannot be baptized for want of faith, they cannot be *saved* for want of faith, must we believe then, that those of them that die in their infancy, are all lost? Who can adopt so revolting a conclusion?' The gospel has nothing to do with infants; neither its precepts, nor ordinances are applicable to them. The gospel is addressed to conscientious moral agents—and not to unconscious infants—nor animals. That children are saved by the mercy of God, through a Saviour, I firmly believe; but they are not saved by the gospel. Infants are saved through the blood of Christ, but they are not saved by faith. It is not necessary that they have faith, nor that they should be *baptized*, in order to be saved. If God had been pleased to do so, he might have taken all 'his elect away in infancy, and saved them, without causing the gospel which requires faith, to be preached at all, and then they would not have been required to be baptized on a profession of faith.' The sentence which I last quoted, betrays great want of discernment, or else a disposition to prejudice the mind against those who conscientiously reject infant baptism.

Again, page 95, he says, 'The opposer of infant baptism might, with equal propriety, have opposed the *circumcision* of infants.' This is not correct. Faith was never required as a qualification for circumcision. The assertion in several places that the children of *believers* were dedicated to God in that rite, is unscriptural; it evinces a want of discernment in the author, and is calcu-

lated to deceive the incautious reader. God never required faith either in the parent or child in order to circumcision. He that was 'born in Abraham's house, or bought with his money', whether a believer or not, was commanded to be circumcised. But who may be baptized according to the New Testament? 'He that *believeth*, and is baptized.' 'If thou *believest* with all thine heart thou mayest.' 'When they *believed* they were baptized.' Strange that Mr. F. will amuse himself by instituting such comparisons and reasoning in this loose and illogical manner.

With regard to his prolonged remarks on Popery, and Unitarianism, I would briefly observe; 1. His statements concerning these topics will not bear inspection. 2. It is not necessary in the present discussion, that they be inspected. If any one wishes to see my incidental allusions to Popery and Unitarianism in my 'Address', and my *explanation*, in my 'Response to the First Congregationalist Church,' he can, by perusing these pamphlets. In them he will find all the lucubrations of Mr. F. anticipated and answered, as far as I deem them worthy of notice. I will, however, just observe in this place, that he has told us when Popery arose, (in seventh century) and what were the causes which contributed to its rise. '1. The favor of secular power and influence under Constantine and his successors. 2. The decline of science. 3. Neglect of the scriptures. 4. The worship of images.' It were easy to employ his conclusive argument, *positive assertion*, and say, 'he is not sustained by a single item of history.' But I admit his causes as generally correct. Still this admission does not clash with my views in the least. For it was the abuse of the precious ordinance of baptism—its application to unbelieving adults and especially to carnal, unconverted babes, in the third fourth, fifth and sixth centuries, removing in this way Jehovah's own boundary line between the church and the world—which originated his *causes* of Popery. These causes of Popery are the natural and legitimate effects of infant baptism. I do not say that these effects are always realized. There

may be holiness and orthodoxy enough in some portions of the church to resist for a while its deleterious influence. The truth of this remark has to a good degree been exemplified by the Congregationalists in New England. Still, it is the direct and natural tendency of infant baptism to secularize the church, and convert it into a national establishment. It will exert an unkindly influence on any church which embraces it. There never was a church which practiced it that has for any great length of time preserved its spirituality. It is in the nature of things impossible, that a church which receives into her bosom 'the precious and the vile', 'those born of the Spirit and those born after the flesh', believers and their carnal, unbelieving offspring, should long preserve her purity. The Congregationalists of this country have in *many things* done *well*. But Congregationalism is not all that it would be if it were not for this unscriptural rite. She cannot bring all her force to bear upon the evils of Papacy in this country while that rite is retained.* She resembles David in Saul's armor. She may augment her numbers and present a fair exterior—but she must give up infant baptism or part with her internal peace and purity; unless some ism shall draw off from her body the sickly humors and morbid secretions which that unauthorized institution never fails to produce.

On page 99, 100, we are told, 'those who reject infant baptism, *often*, if not generally, fall into the error of rejecting the Old Testament,' &c. So, then, because we do not go to the book of Genesis to find the *subjects*, and to Ezekiel to find the *mode* of baptism, under the new dispensation, we must be publicly slandered by this Congregational minister, as rejecters of 'more than one half the Bible'!! But we will bear it patiently. We do not believe in sweeping censures. The Lord rebuke Mr. Fowler. I believe it is generally known that Baptists reverence the authority of the Bible.

* The first divines and ablest men among the Pædobaptists, when reasoning like theological *giants* against the errors of Romanism, are compelled to strike their colors when a Catholic priest calls on them to produce Bible authority for infant baptism.

In reply to all which he has said, page 100 and 101, concerning the ‘validity of *all baptism*’, and the baptism of Roger Williams, and the origin of the Baptists in this country, I would only inquire, is not that baptism which ‘came from heaven’ through the hands of Roger Williams, a *little* better than that which came from the Pope, ‘by way of Germany or Geneva’, through the hands of John Calvin?

CHAPTER XV.

UTILITY OF INFANT BAPTISM.

I can only glance at the author's speculations on this topic. The whole story is soon told. On p. 103, he says: 1. "Infant baptism teaches us in a striking manner, that infants are moral beings; they are not mere animals"!! Query. Does baptism teach the same lesson, when applied by the Pope to a meeting-house bell? Did it afford the same instruction when applied by African bishops to corpses which had been buried, but were disinterred that they might be baptized? But 2. 'It teaches that infants are depraved,' 'polluted from their birth.'—Then it teaches that Mr. Fowler's '*holy children*' must be baptized, to show that they are very '*unholy*,' *depraved, polluted* from their birth!!! Is it possible that men of good sense can fellowship this theology. 3. 'It sets before us the necessity of the cleansing of the soul, by the influence of the Spirit.' But have we not ample proof of the immortality of man, the depravity of the human heart, and the indispensable necessity of regeneration, without resorting to infant baptism? Do not the Baptists understand these sentiments, without that rite, as well as the Congregationalists do with it? I need not enquire, is this a *scriptural* view of the 'utility' of infant baptism? Because on that subject the Bible preserves a profound silence. But I may ask: If these are the reasons why 'polluted' babes should be baptized—do not these reasons apply in all their pristine force, to 'poiluted'—unbelieving *adults*? Why not baptize *them*? 'They are depraved,' 'they need cleansing'—'they are moral beings'—'they are not mere animals.' Do not the statements on p. 103, teach us in a *very striking manner*, the weakness of Mr. F.'s arguments, and the absurdity, and utter uselessness of infant baptism? 4. 'It is admirably fitted to impress upon parents, the solemn and delightful duty of bringing up their children in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, and

thus leading them to a more faithful discharge of their parental duties.' This plea, I doubt not, is often made by Pædobaptists, in the honesty of their souls, and is thought to be plausible indeed. It is entitled therefore to a candid reply. Parents ought to feel their responsibility in this affair. They should assiduously and perseveringly employ *all* the means, which God has *appointed* to bring their children to Christ, and train them for heaven. But has God *appointed* infant baptism? If so, when, where, has he enjoined it? Mr. F. certainly has not told us.—He has attempted it, but he has most certainly failed in his effort.

The question still remains unanswered: where has God required parents to carry their babes to a minister, and have them baptized? I hesitate not, to say without fear, that the declaration will ever be *disproved*, (it may be *denied*, and so may any thing else,) there is not in the book of God, such a requisition. If infant baptism be not required in the Bible, then surely it is sinful for parents to encourage it; for its administration must be an abomination to God, whoever may practice, whoever may recommend it. Should our children ever become believers in Christ, it will be their duty and privilege to obey God, and be baptized for themselves. Shall we rob them of that sacred privilege, which is their *spiritual* birthright? Shall we prevent them from performing their duty? A duty which belongs to God, and their own consciences? If they never become Christians, do we wish them to go down to the gates of eternal death, in the livery of Christianity, with which we have prematurely and without divine authority, clothed them? Is there not danger, that by whispering in the ears of children, the idea, that they are interested in the covenant which God made with Abraham—that they have been dedicated to God by baptism, and sustain a connexion with the church; we may foster in their minds *presumptuous* hopes, and by our well-intended but *ill-timed* and *ill-directed*, and *unauthorized* efforts, be found accessory to a most fatal delusion, which shall eventuate in the ruin of their immortal souls?

It is not true that infant baptism brings the parent under

any *new* obligation, to ‘bring up the child in the nurture and admonition of the Lord’? The eternal God has required this duty at our hands. His authority is paramount to all other considerations, and we are bound to obey him, whether our children have been baptized or not. The parent that does not reverence the authority of Jehovah, will not be likely to reverence the authority of infant baptism, which is a mere invention of man. If infant baptism is the basis of parental obligation, then it follows inevitably, that those parents whose children have not been baptized, are under no obligation, to bring up their children in the fear of the Lord. No one will admit this doctrine.

Congregational ministers very often exhort and urge their churches to be faithful to their baptized children—to remember the *solemn vows* which their baptism necessarily involves. This seems to be the grand avenue through which they expect to find way to the hearts of parents. It would seem that they consider infant baptism a *wonder-working lever*, with which they shall yet heave the moral world. “Now if the apostles practiced infant baptism and had the same view of it, it is utterly unaccountable that they never on any occasion should have employed it for the same purposes. The apostle Paul was a man of rare powers, and had a mind highly enriched and embellished with science and literature. He was master of the various topics which he discussed. He displayed much adroitness in availing himself of the most natural and popular arguments in his favor. Why did he and all the rest, while inculcating the mutual duties of parents and children, omit, at all times, to mention the oath of parents and the dedication of children by the sacred rite of baptism? The inspired penmen were conscious that they were writing for posterity, and that the canon of scripture was designed to form a complete body of theoretical and practical divinity for the guidance of all future generations. If, then, Pædobaptism held in *their* view as conspicuous a place in religious education as it does in the estimation of its modern advocates, they without doubt would have given it a prominent place among the appropriate arguments to persuade parents to ‘bring up their children in the nur-

ture and admonition of the Lord.' But on this argument they preserve a profound silence throughout their writings. If, as some say, there were no reasons for a particular command for infant baptism, yet it is truly surprising that they should never, on any occasion, have mentioned it incidentally for the purpose of argument and illustration." They often made a practical use of baptism and urged those believers, who had been 'buried in baptism,' to walk in newness of life. But never in one single instance do they mention *infant* baptism while reproving or commending parents for their negligence or fidelity in the religious education of their children. Paul exhorts parents to be faithful to their children, but he never does this on the ground of their baptismal vows. He exhorts children to obey their parents, and attend in early youth to the duties of religion; but he never urges these duties by the consideration that their parents were believers, nor that they were included in the Abrahamic covenant, nor that they had been baptized in infancy and by their parents dedicated to God. The truth is, no such rite was practiced, and the apostles were utter strangers to this modern Pædobaptist argument.

Mr. F. thinks it strange that infant baptism should have prevailed so early in the church, and yet no one record the precise time of its introduction, if it were not received from the apostles. But to me it appears much more strange that it should have prevailed, and yet none of the apostles in their writings, nor any historian, sacred or profane, ever mentioned it or have any reference to it until the third century. The reader will judge for himself.—The origin of various other unauthorized ceremonies which are now rejected by all protestants, cannot easily be deciphered. But Pædobaptists tell us, that as we have the first accounts of them in the third and fourth centuries, we may conclude, with moral certainty, that they began to prevail about the time in which they are first mentioned. On their own rule of judging, we conclude therefore with *moral certainty*, that infant baptism *began* to prevail about the commencement of the third, and became popular in the beginning of the fifth centuries. And finally, Mr. F.

reasons most triumphantly, and proves most conclusively, (he thinks) that infant baptism is a very useful rite, because, in several Pædobaptist churches where it prevails, a great proportion of those who have become Christians were baptized in infancy!! Let me balance this wonderful argument in favor of infant baptism, by urging against it an argument of precisely the same character. I know of no better way to show its weakness and folly. Not more than about five in fifty of those whom I have baptized in various places and at different times had been sprinkled in infancy. Yes, strange as it may appear, as many as forty-five out of fifty were converted without having been dedicated to God by that rite!! But any one, who knows that the Congregationalists sprinkle their children, while the Baptists do not baptize their babes, can easily account for both these facts without ascribing any magical influence to infant baptism. Does any man seriously believe that sprinkling a few drops of water on the face of an 'infant of a span long,' which knows not its right hand from the left, secures or in any way *affects* the salvation of its soul? If so, I pity his delusion. Are not the children of Baptists as likely to be saved, as the children of Pædobaptists? What say undeniable facts in this case? I sincerely regret that infant baptism should ever have been enforced by such unsound and fanciful arguments. There are many other things in these lectures which can easily be disproved.

I have prosecuted this examination far enough to show, that the reasoning is illogical—many of the arguments are based on false principles—the premises unsupported and the inferences, of course, valueless—many of the authorities spurious—the misquotations numerous—the misrepresentations abundant—the statements contradictory—the theology unsound, and the style bombastic. I hope Mr. F. will carefully *review* the work himself and inquire seriously, whether in the day of final judgment, when the books shall be opened, he wishes *this book* which contains his lectures on the mode and subjects of baptism to be opened, when the Judge shall say, 'Give an account of thy stewardship'? If, after reviewing the work, he feels that

he has done his duty as a minister of Jesus, and written on baptism 'the truth, the *whole* truth, and nothing but the truth,' I have nothing further to request of him. One of us is laboring under a most awful mistake. If I am mistaken, may God in mercy show me my error.

My Pædobaptist friends! I exhort you to examine this subject critically and fairly. Sooner or later, we must relinquish all our errors—the sooner they are abandoned, the better. I fear that you have not felt all that interest in the subject that you should have done. Most of you were sprinkled in infancy, and as you came forward into active and pious life, you were told that all your duty, so far as this precious ordinance is concerned, was performed by proxy, that is, by your parents. This is a very *easy* way of performing your duty, and having been told by your parents and your minister that this is a correct and scriptural way of doing the business, you have settled down at ease, and you do not of course examine this subject with those feelings of lively interest as you would if you were about to be baptized as your own act. In that case you would solemnly inquire, Am I a scriptural subject? What does God require when he says, 'Arise and be baptized'? And now if any thing occurs to jostle your minds and shake your confidence in the propriety of infant baptism or sprinkling for baptism—the parent, the minister, the church, all lift their voices, 'Oh baptism is not essential to salvation! One mode is as good as another! Infant baptism has always been practiced since the days of the Apostles,' &c. Now I entreat you by the love of the Spirit, and by that dear name through which we hope for eternal life, to remember that Christ is king in Zion. 'Tis his to command, it is *ours* to obey.' If you can find *good evidence* that sprinkling is baptism—practice it. If God has any where in his word required infant baptism,—continue it. Otherwise, it is sinful to call sprinkling *baptism*, and it is wrong to have our children baptized. Jesus says 'if ye love me keep my commandments.' I pray God you may not be left to say, 'this command of the Saviour is not essential. It is only an outward ordinance, and no matter how it is performed.' Such re-

marks plainly indicate, not the spirit of willing obedience, but the spirit of rebellion. It is virtually taking the place of Zion's legislator, and putting him who loved us and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and to whom belong praise and dominion forever, in the place of a servant! When we do this, we '*overdo*.' When we do less than Jesus has required, and sprinkle a believer instead of baptizing him, then, to use the style of Mr. F. we '*underdo*.' If you do not approve of my writings on this subject, will you take your New Testament and read all that is said on baptism, set down as you go along every text that requires sprinkling and infant sprinkling, and when you have done, publish the result to the world; or at least be ready, when your final Judge shall inquire 'who required these at your hands?' to show him the texts, and say, 'here, Lord, are the passages that required me to have my children baptized.' Remember that however valuable the Old Testament is, (and rich and valuable is that sacred book) it has nothing to do with the positive institutions of the Gospel church under the new dispensation. Baptism was not appointed until after the Old Testament was written. Of course it would be manifestly absurd in our inquiries on the rite of baptism to repair to this book, which was written long before that rite was instituted.

I exhort you, my Baptist brethren, to hold fast the ordinances of the gospel, as you find them in the word of God. Be thankful for the light you have received on the subject of Christian baptism, and hold up that light before the world. Cherish the spirit of kindness toward Pædobaptist Christians, and at the same time, in every proper way, bear testimony against their errors. Let us be humble enough to hear patiently and profitably of our own errors, and as fast as we discover, relinquish them. Let us endeavor, on this and every other subject, 'to speak the truth in love.' Above all, as we have been 'buried by baptism', and raised up in the likeness of Christ's resurrection, before God and the world, let us walk in newness of life, and live like 'pilgrims and strangers on the earth.'

The happiest way to show the value of our principles, is to do it by purity of heart and holiness of life.

Finally, I request my reader, as a thinking, moral agent, accountable only to God for his theological views and religious practices, to examine and judge carefully for himself. Sinner ! ‘repent and be baptized.’ ‘He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved ; he that believeth not shall be damned.’ ‘The mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.’

CHAPTER XVI.

COMMUNION.

ON page 105, Mr. Fowler introduces the subject of 'free communion.' I will briefly examine his remarks on this topic. In the first place, his reasoning proceeds on principles which I have already noticed and endeavored to refute. If his views of baptism are well sustained, most of his remarks on communion are plausible, and deserve attention. But if his views of baptism have been fairly disproved, then his arguments in favor of open communion are utterly devoid of force. For this reason my strictures may with propriety be very concise.

2. His language appears to me to be indefinite, and his ideas confused and indistinct. He inveighs against 'close communion.' I believe a little attention to the subject will clearly show that his communion is as close as mine. He is willing to commune with all whom he considers duly qualified for that rite, according to scripture. So am I. I presume he agrees with his own brethren generally that none but baptized church members, who walk orderly, and believe the 'fundamentals' of religion, have any right to communion. If he does not take this ground, he is no friend to gospel order, nor is he in fellowship with the great body of Pædobaptists on the subject. Let any man claim that he has a right to church privileges without baptism, and who will receive him? The Congregationalists will not, nor the Methodists, nor the Episcopalians, nor the Presbyterians, nor the Baptists. To adopt this plan would be to give up all order, and fill our churches with anarchy and confusion. If he *does* take the common Pædobaptist ground, then his communion proceeds on the same principle as ours, precisely. He will commune with all baptized church members who walk orderly—and so will we. But when we inquire what is baptism? who are subjects of that ordinance?—at once we differ. Hence, if he murmurs about our obtuseness of mind on baptism, he has no good reason to complain

of our communion, the terms of which correspond exactly with his own.

It was unfair for him to say, page 107, that we ‘admit that the only point of difference here respects the *mode*.’ The ‘point of difference’ is not about the *mode*, but *baptism itself*. All his protracted remarks concerning the *posture* in prayer, extemporaneous and written sermons, the manner, time and place of celebrating the Lord’s Supper, &c. are futile and unworthy of notice, until he has fairly proved that baptism has sundry modes, and that sprinkling is one. I repeat it, this, and not the plan of communion, is the point at issue between us.

Again, it was ungenerous for him to say, that the only important point of difference between us respects the *mode*, when it is well known that we have more serious objections against his *subjects*. We remonstrate against sprinkling, as having no foundation on the word of God, no basis on correct philology, no support from the history of the first ages of the Christian church. But we object more strenuously against the sprinkling of carnal babes, because we have no authority from God to baptize them in any form, and because the practice tends to break down all distinction between the church of Christ and the world.

3. I am sorry that he has misrepresented our views, used unkind and acrimonious language, and charged all the blame of denominational divisions on us. He says, ‘why **BAR** us from their communion?’ ‘This grieves *all unbiassed and humble Christians*,’ &c. This language is very plain; I leave others to judge of its kindness and modesty. The Baptists, it seems, are a *proud, biassed*, anti-christian sect, because their communion grieves, not some, but *all unbiassed and humble Christians*. We will try to bear reproach patiently. If our views of baptism and church order are founded on the Bible—and we honestly think they are—then we have not merited this reproach, and we are not accountable for the divisions which arise among Christians, in consequence of the departure of others from the laws of God’s house.

We regret extremely, that there should be divisions among the saints. But we dare not even for the sake of

union, desirable as it is, to alter the charter of Zion nor legislate for the church of Christ. We are conscientious in our practices and intend to follow implicitly the directions of our King, as we understand them. We love our brethren who dissent from us, but we love Jesus better. It is not pleasant to have our views misrepresented, our motives impeached, and our characters traduced.—We are quite willing that our sentiments should be examined and disproved, if they will not bear the light of truth. If Mr. F. can show us that it is the will of the *Master* that we sprinkle our babes and take them into the bosom of the church, we are ready to obey our Lord, and hold communion with him in all things which are required of us and in which we can possibly fellowship ourselves.—But really, he must exhibit more candor and employ better arguments, and pursue a more open and manly and meek and modest course than he has hitherto on this subject, or we shall not be likely to embrace his views.—We ‘*bar* them from our communion.’!

The same door which Christ has opened, at which *we* entered the church, by which we came *ourselves* to the communion table, is still open, as wide as ever? If Mr. F., or any one, who ‘believes with all the heart,’ is disposed to enter at that door, we feel to say sincerely, ‘come in, thou blessed of the Lord, why standest thou *without*?’ Does *he* wish to make laws for *us*? Does he insist that we must fellowship *him*, in sprinkling, and infant sprinkling, when we cannot fellowship *ourselves* in those things? Must we love him *better* than we love ourselves? Must we love *his* views, which appear to us unscriptural and wrong, better than *our own* honest views of *truth*? Must we hold communion with him, dearer than the last will and testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ? The demand is unreasonable. It is not founded on benevolence. If Mr. F. believed that sprinkling, and nothing else, was baptism, it would be no proof of benevolence—but a violation of the law of love—and an infraction of the rules of Christian courtesy—to invite him to commune with me, while I knew that he considered me as unbaptized. I might with propriety, labor to show him that his views on

baptism were incorrect, but I could not with the least propriety, find fault with him for not communing with me. while I acknowledged that baptism ought to precede communion, unless it were proper to find fault with him, for his consistency in carrying out honest principles into action. If he does not agree with us in our views, we are perfectly willing that he should enjoy *his own*, among those with whom he *does* harmonize. We wish to enjoy *unmolested*, the same precious privilege. But we do not love to be accused of bigotry and uncharitableness, because we cannot find any thing in the 17th Chapter of Genesis, which requires us to have our children baptized: nor because we cannot possibly see, how a man can be ‘buried’ in *sprinkling*.

This subject may be briefly, and fairly illustrated, in the following familiar dialogue between a Congregationalist and a Baptist; in which Mr. F.’s arguments shall be concisely, but honorably answered. That is, so far as I understand them. If I do not understand his views, he will be willing perhaps, at some future time, to favor me and the public, with a more intelligent exhibition of Congregational views on this topic. If I do injustice to his arguments, *undesignedly*, when convicted of the fact, I hope the organ of self-esteem will not be so fully developed on my cranium, nor the pride of my heart so great, as to prevent a suitable acknowledgment.

Congregationalist. Brother B., I wish we could commune together at the Lord’s table.

Baptist. It is indeed desirable that we should. I am sure I shall be glad to join with you in the celebration of that ordinance, if we can by this means promote our mutual edification and comfort. What is your plan, Sir? State your own views fully.

C. I will; in the first place, communion is an ordinance of the church.

B. Yes; I agree with you perfectly.

C. In the second place, baptism should precede admission into the church.

B. Yes, I heartily concur. They ‘were baptized’ ‘admitted to the church,’ and then they continued among other

things, 'in breaking of bread.' This is surely the gospel plan.

C. Why then can we not commune with all who have joined the church by gospel baptism?

B. We can, Sir; that is, if their lives are regular, and their walk orderly.

C. Why, it seems that we agree about the terms of communion!

B. Yes, perfectly, for aught that I can see.

C. Well, then; if we can agree what baptism is, and who are subjects of this ordinance, I do not see but that we may move along pleasantly together.

B. Yes; and if we can agree on these topics, I shall rejoice. What do you understand by baptism?

C. I consider baptism to be an affusion of water in the name of the 'sacred three.'

B. Why, Sir, you astonish me. Why, baptism is most evidently the immersion of a believer. I am constrained to differ from you on that point entirely.*

C. Immersion is valid baptism I acknowledge; but I prefer sprinkling, and *mode* is not essential. Do not be tenacious about a mere ceremony.

B. But, Sir, we have *agreed* already that baptism, though not essential to salvation, is nevertheless essential to a standing in the church, and a divinely appointed prerequisite to communion. Do you admit any to your church and communion without baptism?

C. Oh, no. However pious any may be, we insist on their being baptized and joined to the church before they come to communion.

B. Well, then, baptism with you is essential to communion, is it not?

C. Yes, but *immersion* is not essential to *baptism*.

B. That is the point at issue. Something *is* essential to baptism, I suppose?

C. Yes.

* The reader will observe, it is not proposed here to enter into an argumentative discussion on baptism, but to show the scriptural relation which the one ordinance sustains to the other. This relation is generally admitted by Pædobaptists.

B. Well, then, if baptism be immersion, *immersion* is essential to baptism. But if baptism be sprinkling, then sprinkling is essential to baptism.

C. No. Both are baptism.

B. What! One and the same word mean to sprinkle a few drops of water, and a burial or an immersion in water! Accomplish the same object and represent the same thing by two ceremonies as dissimilar as sprinkling and immersion! I am surprised at this view of the subject.— Besides, you apply this sacred rite, which was designed only for believers, to unconscious babes. It appears to me that infant baptism has no support from the Bible.

C. Then you will *bar* me from your communion, and grieve all ‘unbiassed, humble Christians’?

B. *Bar* you from communion! What do you mean? I was simply expressing an honest opinion. Am I to blame for having an opinion? or for expressing it? or acting according to it? We had agreed that baptism ought to precede church fellowship and communion, and as soon as we begin to inquire what is baptism, you fly from the subject and talk about ‘close communion’!

C. Then we must separate, must we, and not commune together after all? Now I will admit your baptism. I am willing to commune with you, but you will bar me from your table!

B. Your remarks seem to imply that you are quite liberal, and that I am *illiberal*; but let us look at this matter candidly. You have, in your last sentence, given a good reason why you should be willing to commune with me and offered my apology for not communing with you. You ‘admit my baptism,’ you say, and are willing to commune with me. This you are bound to do on the common principle, ‘that we ought to commune with all *evangelical* baptized church members.’ But as I cannot in conscience admit your baptism, for the very same reason, and on the very same principle, I ought not to commune with you.

C. Then you will shut me out.

B. Shut you out! No, God forbid. The door is open, come in, my brother, ‘Arise and be baptized.’ This is

the door which Christ has opened. At this door I entered myself. This is the Lord's door to the Lord's *table*, and not mine. I have no authority to open a new door for your accommodation. But I think we need not separate. You say that immersion is good baptism?

C. Yes, I cheerfully admit your baptism.

B. Well, now, dear brother, do have the kindness and love to commune with me in *baptism*, and then I can go and commune with you in the ordinance of the supper.—The ordinance of baptism is as precious as that of the supper, and it is mentioned much more frequently in the New Testament: we should not run over one ordinance to come at another; and as baptism comes first in the arrangement of heaven, I affectionately invite you to commune with me in immersion *first*, and then we will go hand in hand up the 'King's highway' to the Lord's table.

C. No, you ought to commune with me now.

B. What! without your being baptized?

C. No; but you ought to admit my baptism.

B. But this I cannot do, in conscience. I would not ask you to violate your conscience. But you can without sacrificing conscientious principles submit to immersion; because you believe it to be right. Come then and be immersed, and we will travel on toward Mount Zion together.

C. No; I am not willing to give up sprinkling, nor the sprinkling of infants. And so you will *bar* me from your communion?

B. No; you *bar* yourself, by not submitting to the Master's direction, and by refusing to do what you admit is right; and what you can do as well as not, and then you murmur at me because I will not to please you, give up conscientious principles. Is this charitable and generous, my brother? If you are really anxious to commune with us, I am sure you must be willing to do all that you can in conscience, to accomplish an object so desirable. If you will not do what you can, without the sacrifice of principle (we do not ask you to do that) just as well as not, it really seems to me quite unreasonable and uncour-

teous in you to insist that we shall barter away our principles, which we verily believe to be evangelical, to please you!

C. You have succeeded thus far with your restricted communion, better than I expected, but I wish you to answer the eight arguments that follow. (See Mr. Fowler's arguments p. 108.)

B. I will try to give a brief but candid reply to your arguments.

C. 'Free communion should be practiced because the obligations of brotherly love require it.'

B. I have some objections to the language in which your argument is couched. You speak of free communion. Now I know of no communion in the world, more free than that of the Baptists. The door to communion is always open. *Believe, be baptized, join the church, commune.* This gospel door is open, and we exhort you, exhort *all* in the name of Jesus, to come in; yes, 'ten thousand times ten thousand more, are welcome still to come.' And whoever comes in will find that we breathe the very air of freedom and tread the circle of love, and meet on the common level of Christianity: We have 'one Lord, one faith, one baptism. We have one *Master* even Christ, and all of us are *brethren*.'

C. But you ought to love other Christians too.

B. Yes, certainly. And we cannot be *Christians* ourselves, unless we love all that love our Lord Jesus.

C. Well, then you ought to commune with them.

B. You reason, my brother, without first principles. I think I can show you that we are not bound to commune with all that we love as Christians.

C. What! not commune with all Christians that you love?

B. Do you do it yourself, my brother? Have you not said it was a rule of your church not to commune with any, however pious, until they have been baptized and joined to the church?

C. Yes, that is the common rule, not only of Congregationists but of Piedobaptists generally.

B. Well, then, have you not some individuals in your society, who give evidence of piety, who have not been baptized and united with the church?

C. Yes, I know of several; and I am grieved to think they will not do their duty and profess religion.

B. Do you invite them to communion?

C. Oh! no.

B. Why not? Do you not love them?

C. Oh! yes; God knows that I love them and hope to meet them in heaven.

B. Well, then, the 'obligations of brotherly love' do not lead you to commune with unbaptized Christians. You *love* all Christians among Unitarians and Catholics, but you will not commune with them. I heard a Fall River minister, who seems to be quite fierce for open communion, say not long since, that he would not even invite some other open communion ministers in this village to pray!! And yet it is to be hoped that he loves them. Your argument therefore is fairly shown to be fallacious. It proceeds on a false principle. You will not commune with those Christians who are not orthodox. You will not commune with Christians whom you dearly love, if they refuse to be baptized. For this very reason, because we do not consider you baptized, we refuse to commune with you; 'but we love your souls, and we are grieved because you will not do what seems to us your duty.'

C. But I think you ought not to mark out our duty concerning baptism; we must judge for ourselves.

B. Why, then, do you take the liberty to 'mark out our duty' with regard to communion? Have we not as good a right to judge about our duty with respect to one ordinance, as you have of yours with respect to the other? Has not the Congregational church a right to judge for herself of the qualifications of candidates for both these ordinances? Has not the Baptist church the same right? Or must the Baptist church be governed by the theological views of the Congregational church?

C. 'Free communion should be practiced, because the principles of the farewell prayer of Christ require it.'

B. This argument, like the preceding, is based on a false principle, and, of course, it is forceless. Christ prayed that his people might be *united*, not by the magic influence of communion, but sanctified *by* and united *in* the TRUTH. This argument supposes that communion with each other at the Lord's table would produce union in sentiment and feeling among the saints. No reflecting mind can admit the validity of this argument, because it is founded on a false principle, and contradicted by plain and well known facts. Those who commune together in the same church do not agree in all their religious views. Communion has no direct tendency to produce unanimity in sentiment. Look at our open communionists; Unitarians, Presbyterians, Methodists, Episcopalians, Unitarian Baptists, Congregationalists, &c. all pleading for 'open communion,' and most of these denominations, like the Jews and the Samaritans, 'have no dealings with each other.' They very rarely, if ever, commune with each other—and if they do, they go directly back 'to their own company,' and are no more united than they were before. Indeed, these open communionists very rarely, if ever, agree, unless they occasionally agree to find fault with the Baptists for their 'close communion.' If they can only 'fasten on ignorant minds' the belief that the Baptists are bigoted and uncharitable, it is the most successful weapon they can wield against us. Suppose we could induce all professed Christians in Fall River to commune together for a year to come—has any one the folly to believe that this would sweep away all denominational prejudices, and produce unanimity in feeling and sentiment? If you think it would, brother, go try the force of your principle among yourselves. Let us see Unitarians and Methodists, Congregationalists and Socinian Baptists, all brought sweetly to harmonize in their views, by the magic influence of 'open communion,' and we shall begin to think there is some force in your argument. It is vain, Sir, to reason against 'restricted communion,' while you practice it yourself, and bring unsubstantial arguments to condemn your own practice as well as ours.

C. 'Free communion should be practiced, because it is in agreement with the word of God.'

B. But we have agreed with Baptists and Pædobaptists generally, that it is *not* in agreement with the word of God to commune with unbaptized persons who do not belong to the church. If you cannot prove, therefore, that sprinkling is baptism, and that 'little children of believers' are to be sprinkled, it is not, on your own plan, in agreement with the word of God to commune with you.

C. 'It should be practiced, because no man or sect of men may prescribe as a condition of communion what the Bible does not enjoin as condition of salvation.'

B. No man or sect of men have a right to prescribe *any* condition of communion whatever. Jehovah has already prescribed his own conditions, and they are plainly exhibited in the Apostolic church at Jerusalem. (See Acts ii.) Observe, this church was to be a model for all others in every subsequent age. The Apostles at that time were filled *with* and baptized (*en*) *in* the Holy Ghost. They could not at that time have erred. Now what is Jehovah's condition of communion as these Apostles understood it? The candidates were convicted; they inquired, 'what must we do?' they were converted; they 'gladly received the Apostles' word', that is, they believed in Christ, for of him the Apostles spake; 'they were baptized'—'added to them', that is, to the church; 'they continued steadfastly in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread and in prayers.' These are the conditions of communion as prescribed by Zion's king. It appears that souls who have been awakened, convicted, brought to believe in Christ, baptized, joined to the church, and continue in the Apostles' doctrine—that is, are evangelical in their views, and holy in their lives—have a scriptural right to communion. I am sorry that you have taken the *liberty* to adopt another plan of church building, and now murmur because we will not embrace your plan and commune with you.

C. 'But we ought to receive all that Christ receives.'

B. This implies another false principle. Christ re-

ceives whom he pleases. He has told us whom to receive to external communion, and we must follow his direction, unless we take it upon us, to legislate for his church. I have now just returned from the bedside of a poor dying woman; she lay gasping for breath, and with a look of intense anxiety, she entreated me to pray for her. I knelt down and begged of Jesus to receive her departing, *breathless* spirit. I hope Jesus did receive her soul, for after prayer, she said she could give *herself* to him.—But it would have been sinful in me, if she had desired it, even, to receive her to communion; because, in doing so, I should have transcended my authority from the God of ordinances. This argument is futile.

C. ‘But if Christ communes with them, shall mortal man assume the responsibility of rejecting them from Christ’s table?’

B. You blend together two things which are perfectly distinct in their character. This involves your reasoning in a cloud. You do not pretend that Christ eats bread, and drinks wine with any Christians, do you?

C. Oh no; but he holds *spiritual* communion with them.

B. Yes; but we were treating of external communion. Why do you fly from the subject? do you wish to blend two things which are distinct, for the purpose of gaining undue advantage in the argument? the statement ought to stand thus: Christ holds *spiritual* communion with some, while we refuse them *external* communion.

C. Yes, that is my meaning. I think you are wrong.

B. We hold spiritual fellowship with many as Christians *ourselves*, with whom we cannot join in external communion. Do you not think those pious individuals which you just now named, who have not been baptized, nor joined the church, are among those with whom Christ communes *spiritually*?

C. O yes, certainly. I do not think that they enjoy so much of his presence and blessing as they would if they did *all* their duty, but still he blesses them in all that they do which is right.

B. And yet your church does not, *you* do not commune with them?

C. No.

B. Well, *thou* art the '*mortal man* that dost take upon thyself the responsibility of rejecting from the Lord's table those with whom Christ holds *spiritual* communion.' And you merely take the responsibility to do right in this case; you do as Christ has directed you. He has given you no authority to commune with them. While they refuse to be baptized and join the church, they bar themselves from the communion. You have no blame in the case, if you have plainly pointed out to them their duty and exhorted them to do it. I hope you will hereafter keep sight of the distinction between Christian fellowship and external church communion. Christian fellowship is enjoyed among all the saints of all denominations, so far as they know each other's exercises, joys and sorrows. External church communion is quite another thing. Many speak of communion as a *test* of Christian love, and seem to suppose that the only way for Christians to show their friendship to each other is to sit down and take bread and wine together.—This is wrong. The leading design of that ordinance is 'to show forth the Lord's death till he come.' It is to be feared that some in their zeal for open communion have almost forgotten the Saviour and lost sight of the design of that solemn rite. Or, at least, that they have considered *that* as the leading object which, to say the most, is merely an incidental affair.

C. 5. 'Free communion should be practiced, because on no other ground can the glorious things spoken of Zion be fulfilled.'

B. This argument is based on the same principle as your second precisely, and therefore it demands no other reply.

C. 6. 'It should be practiced, because we shall otherwise fall into other inconsistencies.'

B. Then you would have us fall into one inconsistency to avoid another. I should rather avoid both, and not 'do evil that good may come,' or do evil to prevent evil. But

what are the '*scandalous*' inconsistencies to which you refer?

C. Why, you 'admit that our churches and ministers are the churches and ministers of Christ: you invite our ministers to preach for you, and then *bar* us from your communion.' 'Why will you thus *scandalize* the Christian name?'

B. Keep cool, my brother; we ought not to use expressions while discussing this subject that shall offend the most refined Christian sensibility. If we deal too freely in terms of '*scandal*,' and *drive* each other to communion, I fear we shall not be happy under the influence of a good spirit when we get there. I wish to speak the plain truth, but I will try to do it in love. I admit that your churches are the churches of Christ, in the common acceptation of that term. That they are churches, standing in the order of the gospel in every *important* particular, I do not admit. If I *could* admit that, I should be ready to commune with you. To refuse communion with you is one evangelical way in which we may bear testimony to you and to the world, that we disfellowship your sprinkling, and especially *infant* sprinkling, while we esteem you as Christians. As for our inconsistency in hearing your ministers preach, we were not aware that we were doing wrong in this matter. We rejoice to say, that in general your ministry, so far as we can judge, is evangelical. We rejoice to hear the *truth* from the lips of any man who sustains a good moral character. We have never supposed that by hearing your ministers preach, or inviting them to preach, we sanctioned the sprinkling of babes as a divine rite. If these were our views, we would never, if we could help it, hear another of your ministers preach 'while the world standeth,' unless we should change our sentiments on the mode and subjects of baptism. But communion is an act of the church, and if we commune with you, we do to all intents and purposes, admit your order of church building as scriptural. This we cannot do, as candid and conscientious and accountable beings.

C. 'Free communion should be practiced, because

it is sanctioned by the practice of the church of Christ in the ages succeeding the apostles and for many centuries after.'

B. We look to the Apostolic church for our model.—That church did not commune with those who practiced sprinkling for baptism, nor with those who dedicated their sucklings to God by baptism; for both practices were unknown in the apostolic and the following age. With respect to the church so called, from the third to the fifteenth century; if we follow *all* her practices we must have *infant communion*, exorcism and a Pope.

C. 'It should be practiced, because the church on earth ought to become as far as possible like the church in heaven.' '*There*, close communion finds no countenance.'—'*There*, one table is spread.' 'As there is but one table above, there should be but one below.'

B. Now, Sir, this reasoning appears quite specious, and as imposing as an air-balloon, and it is just about as substantial. Not to speak unkindly, but frankly—it appears strange to me that a man who claims to know any thing about 'critical and calm and kind discussion', should employ such a deceptive and shallow argument as this, on a subject so solemn and momentous. It would seem that he must have borrowed his ideas of heaven from the Koran, and not from the Bible. If our communion in heaven shall consist in eating bread and drinking wine, then there is force in this argument; if not, there is none at all. False principles are the basis of false reasoning. What would be thought of the far famed *Graham*, if in his lectures on the science of human life, while endeavoring to dissuade his hearers from the use of meat, he should tell them 'that the inhabitants of heaven eat no meat, but live on vegetables—and earth should as far as possible resemble heaven'!! The reasoning would proceed on the same principle, and the idea is not more gross than the one here exhibited. In both the real and the supposed case, there is an awful want of discrimination with regard to logical principles, or a very unjustifiable attempt to impose on the superficial observer. There will not be so much as one

table in heaven ; that is, such as we have on earth. 'The deathless souls, and the spiritualized and glorified and immortal bodies of the saints, blooming in eternal youth, will not require the earthly symbols of bread and wine. There, spiritual, holy, perfect, enrapturing communion of 'heart with heart and soul with soul,' will pervade the unnumbered, holy, happy throng. We rejoice that we may even here have a foretaste of that blessed communion, and we anticipate with sacred joy that heavenly and eternal communion. But what has this to do with the present argument ? Nothing at all. Besides, if the argument were sound, then what wicked folks the Congregationalists are, to set up a table of their own, and shut out the Catholics, and Swedenborgians, and even the Unitarians and other people who think themselves quite as good as the Congregationalists ! What do they mean, to have so many tables, when there is but one 'table in heaven' ! The bare act of communing together,—while our hearts do not beat in holy unison, and while we do not agree in our views of gospel doctrine and ordinances,—would not make us resemble the church above. This argument is fallacious.

C. 'The practice of close communion cannot continue forever ; it is to me doubtful if it survives the present century.'

B. I hope it will not. It will undoubtedly cease when the *cause* is removed. If infant sprinkling and sprinkling for baptism shall go into disuse, (and I pray God they may before the present century shall have rolled into eternity,) the sounding of their funeral knell will be the signal of free communion between Congregationalists and Baptists and all orthodox Christians. Come, brother, if you will hereafter baptize, that is, *immerse* believers only, and receive them into the church, and consent to bury infant sprinkling, I will aid you in the funeral obsequies, and write an appropriate epitaph—and we will erect a 'free communion table on the very tomb of the departed,' in A. D. 1835.

The reader cannot fail to see that the question between the Baptist and the Congregationalist is not about com-

munion. In that we agree. What is baptism, and who are gospel subjects of that sacred rite? These are the questions.

There is only one statement more of Mr. F. to which I invite attention. 'The advocates of close communion shut out from the table of our blessed and only Redeemer probably *nine-tenths* of his *true followers*!' Now I wish to ask a few questions for the solution of my reader. These questions are 'calculated for the meridian' of Fall River, but will answer for adjacent towns. 1. Is it a fact that the Baptists have shut out *nine-tenths* of Christ's *true followers*, or has Mr. F. overshot the mark? 2. Has not every church a right to govern herself by the law of God as she *understands* it? 3. Does not every Christian, whose moral character is good, after learning the rules and regulations of all our churches, unite with Methodists, Congregationalists, Unitarians, or Baptists, just as his inclinations prompt him, and just where he thinks his spiritual interests will be best promoted? 4. Is not this right? 5. Have not the Baptists always plead for freedom in matters of religion and conscience? When, and where have they propagated their sentiments, or guarded the Lord's table, or infringed on the rights of others, by the use of sword or musket, fire or faggot, ecclesiastical tyranny or legal coercion? 6. Is there much danger that a little puny *one-tenth* sect will jeopardize the interests of all the rest of the Christian world? 7. Why all this clamor about close communion? Is it a fact that these 'nine tenths' of Christ's *true followers* are really anxious to commune with the Baptists? 8. Why do not these *nine-tenths*, who are pleading for open communion, show the value of the scheme by communing with each other? 9. Do not the Unitarians hold to open communion, and do they not practice it too? Do they not carry their bread and wine all over the house on communion days, and offer the elements to all—yes *all*, whether they have been baptized, or rantized, or *no-tized*—whether they profess to be Christians or not? Is not this giving Mr. F. an opportunity, as well as others, to go and join with them, and try the strength of their own arguments, and

see if communing together will not operate like a charm to make them all good, humble, orthodox Christians? 10. Have we, after all, but one open communion church in Fall River? (which claims not to be a church, but a Unitarian Association.) 11. Do not all these churches adopt their own rules of communion, and claim the privilege of doing so, as well as the Baptists? Have we not all a right to adopt the rules of the Bible as *we* understand them? 12. And finally, in view of the exhibitions of human depravity all around us, in the world and in the church, among ministers and people; and in view of that eternal world to which we haste, and that judgment seat before which we must all stand, and give an account of our stewardship—does it not become us to study most assiduously to know and do our heavenly Father's will, and prepare to meet our God?

ERRATA.

Page 45, under figure 1, for Polybus, read *Polybius*. P. 59, 6th line from top, for argument, read *agreement*. P. 101, 2d. line from bottom, omit the word *not*. P. 178, 2d. line from top, for baptized, read *baptize*. P. 184, 4th line from the top, for apostles, read *apostle*; same page, bottom line for spiritual, read *temporal*.

NOTE.

Mr Fowler, on p. 11, in a note, uses this language:—
 “An attempt is being made, to circulate widely in impression, that a young man at Andover, has lately become an advocate of exclusive immersion, in consequence of a remarkable conversation, said to have been held between him and Professor Stuart, but the story *is wholly* without foundation; and, yet, hundreds may read, and thousands may hear of it, who will never know on earth, that it is *entirely false*. The story has been submitted to Professor Stuart, who says in a letter, dated Nov. 19, 1834; “To the best of my recollection, I never exchanged a word with him on the subject of baptism, at any time, whatever; nor did any other person ever have such a conversation with me.—*Moses Stuart*.” He evidently refers to what I said in that “pamphlet which contains so much of *ridicule* and *vulgarity*, and *personal abuse*, that in *his view*, it was *inexpedient* to notice it.” (See his appendix, note A.)

Now I remark, 1. He has blended two cases together. I did not say, that this was ‘a young man,’ who had the conversation with Professor Stuart. The *young man* at Andover, to which he refers, was another case entirely. 2. I knew that the man, who, as I said, ‘was a worthy member of the Congregational church,’ was at the *time*, living at Reading. But the individual, who first mentioned the case to me, had the impression, that he had *since* removed to Andover. This proves to be a mistake; he is still living in Reading. 3. My object was to show that Professor Stuart would not sanction the statement of ‘Concord,’ viz: that ‘baptizo *means immersion, pouring and sprinkling*.’ After giving the conversation as it was given to me, *as a conversation*, I said, “I cannot vouch for the truth of the above statement.” “I presume it is *substantially* correct.” (See my Address, p. 17.) 4. The ‘story’ it seems, has been submitted to Professor Stuart, and he remembers not any ‘such’ conversation. If the story was not submitted more correctly than he has given it in this note, and more correctly than he has given most of his statements in his lectures, I do not wonder that Profes-

sor Stuart should not have remembered 'such' a conversation. 5. Rev. Messrs. Haynes and Brayton (the gentleman who taught school in this village last winter,) are well acquainted with the man alluded to, and Mr. Brayton has boarded with him, and often heard him relate the facts in the case. It appears that the man was tried on the subject of baptism, he went and conversed with Mr. Stuart, and returned home, and was baptized, as I understand it. But there is nothing very '*remarkable*' in all this, when we consider that Professor Stuart is a man of intelligence and candor, and the enquirer in this case had a conscience. I will here copy a letter verbatim, from the man referred to, which was recently addressed to Mr. Brayton, of Providence. It is in amount the same thing which I stated, although the phraseology is somewhat different. The original is now in the hands of Mr. Brayton.

"Reading, June 25, 1835.

BROTHER BRAYTON:—It is three years last April, since I had the conversation with Prof. Stuart. At that time my mind was very much tried on that subject. Believing Mr. S. to be the best scholar in this country, also believing him to be an honest man, I went and asked him the meaning of the word *baptizo*, as I understood that to be the word which the two parties were contending about. He said the application of water in various ways; a *copious* manner, was the meaning of the word. I asked him if it could be translated *sprinkle*; he said 'it could *not*.' Lest he did not understand me, or I did not understand him, I said, you say then the word *baptizo* cannot be translated *sprinkle*, he said 'no it cannot be translated *sprinkle*.'

Yours in Christian love,

EBEN EATON."

Whether it was pertinent for Mr. Fowler to tell the public that my pamphlet contained so much 'ridicule, vulgarity and personal abuse, that in *his view* it is inexpedient to notice it;' and then often refer to it and grossly misrepresent what I have said; first say that 'in personal controversy he could not consent to embark,' and then declare to the world that a statement in my book was 'wholly without foundation,' entirely false; and pursue the clandestine course which (I believe it is now universally admitted) he has in this controversy, and then tell us that he has consulted 'Concord' among other authors—whether in all this he has exhibited the politeness of the gentleman, the frankness of the Christian, and the dignity of the minister, I leave a candid public to decide.

JUN 6 1938

